

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 4.—OCTOBER, 1891.

I.

THE RELATION OF HUMANITY TO DIVINITY.

BY PRESIDENT J. S. STAHR, PH.D. D.D.

* MAN occupies a unique position in the order of created things. He is a citizen of two worlds, and, as such, the connecting link between two economies, the natural and the spiritual. Linked by his physical organization to the material world, and partaking of the order of development which prevails in the whole natural system, he also transcends this order, and, in virtue of his spiritual endowments, his intellectual and moral life, he belongs to a higher realm in which he unfolds the real significance of his existence under conditions which the physical order cannot control. He belongs to the world of spirit, and his life is moulded by spiritual influences.

The mere statement of this fact, however, does not go far towards determining man's real position. The admission that there are two orders of existence, the natural and the spiritual (or supernatural), only makes room for the contemplation of a higher relation in which both stand as a connected system of things, to God who is the ground or source, the author and

governor, the end or goal of the whole creation. Looking at the subject from this point of view, what shall we say of man? Shall we include him with the other orders of creation, and say that, like every other creature, man was constituted by the act of God so that he has a separate, autonomic existence, inferior, however, to God, and dependent upon Him as the ground and source of his being? Or shall we say that man, constituted by the breath of the Almighty, is the outgoing or efflux of God, a part of the stupendous All, which comes to consciousness and self-poised activity in the personality of man? There is a measure of truth in either view, and both statements are defective in that they do not bring out the whole truth. As we have seen that man forms the connecting link between the natural and the supernatural order, so, in a certain sense, man, in the full development of his life, mediates between the created order and the Creator. He cannot be identified with the Creator; that would be pantheism. He cannot be abstractly separated; that would be deism. He has some things in common with both terms, and his relation to either, accordingly, can be determined only in the light of his relation to the other. That is, if we would determine the relation between humanity and divinity, we must look, not on one side of human nature only, to see what connection there is between it and the divine nature above it, but also on the other side to see the relation between man's physical, psychical and spiritual constitution, and the order of life which prevails in the world to which he apparently belongs, and of which he is, in a certain sense, an integral part.

Looking towards nature we see at once the kinship between man and the physical order of the world in which he lives. It is a mere truism to say that man is the crown and perfection of this whole order. And yet the statement, trite as it is, emphasizes an aspect of the subject without which we cannot get a true insight into the wonderful constitution of man, nor a true conception of nature itself, of its development and meaning. As the perfection of nature, man is not an addition made to it

by a separate act. The crown of nature is not imposed from without. It is the highest point reached in the development or evolution of nature, a process which began by the first creative act, and went forward in a series of steps or stages, not indeed by the operation of blind, natural forces, but by the immanent energy of God Himself, until, as when the refiner purifies silver, the process is complete when he sees his own image in the metal contained in the cupel, the great Creator saw His own image in the work of His hands, and the world was complete.

The development of nature, accordingly, leads up to man. Arrest its development at any point short of man, and it is incomplete. Sunder any form of life from other forms, or take any natural object out of its relation to others as links in the great chain which binds all to man, and it has no meaning. There are, in these days *savans* who claim to have discovered that there is no teleology in the world. But if all nature tends towards man, if every stage of its development is prophetic of the next and of the final or highest, how can we fail to discover the golden cord of meaning which runs through it all? Prof. John Fisk, one of the most pronounced evolutionists in America, says: "The Darwinian theory, properly understood, replaces as much teleology as it destroys. From the first dawning of life we see all things working together towards one mighty goal, the evolution of the most exalted spiritual qualities which characterize humanity." * And again, "I believe it has been fully shown that so far from degrading humanity, or putting it on a level with the animal world in general, the doctrine of evolution shows us for the first time how the creation and the perfecting of Man is the goal toward which Nature's work has been tending from the first." † Such a statement from such a source is certainly significant. The theist, therefore, who does not feel himself called upon to account for the order of nature on purely mechanical principles, discerns in every advancing step a preparation for and approach to the coming of man as nature's destined head and lord.

* *The Destiny of Man*, pp. 113, 114.

† *Ibid.* p. 107.

While, therefore, man is allied to nature, and is, in a certain sense, the product of its ascending movement so that he sums up its whole significance, and embodies in his constitution all its possibilities, he at the same time transcends nature, and reflects upon it powers and capacities which, otherwise, would be far beyond its reach. The pre-eminence of man over nature is evident, first of all, from the world of nature itself which seems to recognize in the coming of man the beginning of a new era in the history of the world. Professor Dana, describing the development of life upon the earth (*), calls the movement *a system of progressive cephalization in the animal structure*; that is to say, in proportion as animal life developed from one geological age to another, the head became more prominent and the brain larger. In the progress of the ages *nature was coming to a head*. Now, in the advent of man this process became complete, both in the size and poise of the head so that no farther progress was possible in the physical structure. Here, then, we have the completion of the process which ran through all the previous ages, and the development of the world from this time forward must hold in the sphere of mind or history. We have said that nature itself seems to recognize this fact. Not only is room made for the coming of man, but there is even a change in the organization of nature to prepare the way for it. This is seen first in the purification of the atmosphere, the increase of dry land, the adjustment of climate, and the structure of the continents, so that the earth becomes a fit place of abode for man. Secondly, while brain substance increased, the bulk of the animal body was reduced at the time of man's appearance in the world. The brain capacity of an average man is more than double that of the most highly developed ape that has yet been found. On the contrary, the huge monsters that were found in the world, in the sea, on the land, and in the air, the fierce and terrible beasts that held sway on the earth, making it seem, when brute force was triumphant, like the work of a demon rather than an actualized

* *Manual of Geology*, p. 596.

thought of God, rapidly disappeared to make room for the supremacy of mind. Thirdly, when the time for man's entrance into the world was approaching, the earth produced, as it had never done before, the plants and animals especially useful to man, providing thus for man's support and ministering to his wants. As Crashaw paraphrased the account of our Lord's first miracle, "The conscious water saw its God and blushed," so we may say of nature when man entered the world:

"Now conscious nature saw its lord,
And bowed, and tribute brought."

Again, this pre-eminence is manifest in man's mastery over nature. Even now this mastery is evident in man's relation to nature, and we have reason to believe that the ideal relation between the two involves a great deal more than we now have any conception of, so that, if it were actualized, the intelligence and will of man would have absolute control of nature. In the order of our life, nature is necessary both to the natural and spiritual life of man, in the sense that there can be no growth or development without it. It is the basis of physical life; it is the condition *sine qua non* of intellectual growth; it conditions the movements of human society without which there can be no moral development. But while this is true, man exercises mastery over nature in that he rises above the hostile influences which prevail in the world, defends himself against the elements and wild beasts, and in the face of obstacles secures the means of comfortable subsistence. He even uses the forces of nature according to their inherent laws, and makes them instruments for the furtherance of his own purposes, pressing them into service on every side, both for the material advancement of the world and for the intellectual and moral elevation of the human family. In consequence of this relation to nature man not only occupies a higher position, but nature itself is lifted up and glorified. Man reacts upon nature, and through his influence and power nature enters into the movement of human history and becomes both a theater and

a factor of progress wholly unlike the unconscious development to which we have previously referred.

From this point of view man is lord of the earth. The endowments which he possesses, the powers which he exercises in this relation, his intelligence and conscious choice of means for the accomplishment of particular ends, suggest at least, if they do not prove, his relation to a higher world from which he has received this dominion and lordship. This presumption is strengthened by the testimony of man's consciousness and the longings and aspirations of the human heart in all ages and climes. Man acknowledges his dependence upon a Higher Power, the source of his being, and he seeks communion and fellowship with God, his soul finding no rest until it rests in Him. Whatever a man's profession may be, he is by nature religious, and this means two things: the outgoing of the heart for communion with God in this life, and the yearning of the soul for immortality, for never-ending, perfect communion with God in the life to come. It is a striking fact, and it seems to us it is one of the strongest arguments, outside of divine revelation, for the immortality of the soul, that, while a man's life runs, in other respects, through a cycle, so that after his powers have passed their prime we notice a gradual falling away or decay, character, the form in which the inner man finds expression, the result of a man's moral and religious life in its reflex action upon the totality of his powers and aptitudes, does not decay, but becomes more and more perfect every year. Does not that look for a continuance beyond the grave? The nature and destiny of man, regarded from this point of view, therefore proclaim with a thousand tongues a higher kinship than that of earth, and relate him to an order of existence not bound up with the natural world in which his life has its beginning. This much is evident to the unprejudiced observer, without any reference to divine revelation. It is the voice of nature crying in our ears, echoing in our hearts, refusing to be silenced at the behest of any school of science or philosophy, or drowned in the din of money-getting and the whirl of dissipation. Says

Prof. Fisk: "The materialistic assumption that there is no such state of things [the existence of thought and feeling without a material brain], and that the life of the soul accordingly ends with the life of the body, is perhaps the most colossal instance of baseless assumption that is known to the history of philosophy. * * * On the other hand, he who regards Man as the consummate fruition of creative energy, and the chief object of Divine care, is almost irresistibly driven to the belief that the soul's career is not completed with the present life upon the earth."*

What we have said thus far is largely negative and only serves to prepare the way for the positive consideration of our subject. We see that while man is the last product of nature's upward movement, he is not ultimately included in the domain of nature. He reaches beyond it and has his proper home and destiny in the spiritual world. Who and what he is, nature, therefore, cannot teach us. We must study him in the light of divine revelation.

Here, at least so far as general principles are concerned, we are at once upon firm ground. Whenever the question turns on the spiritual life of man and his relation to a higher world, the positive, definite statements of Scripture are in sharp contrast with the vague and unsatisfactory results of scientific investigation. Concerning the origin, nature, and destination of man, we are not left to grope in the dark, or sent away with a doubtful or negative answer. We are told explicitly that man comes from God, is made in His image and likeness, and is intended for a life of communion and fellowship with Him for ever. "Beloved, now are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him even as He is," 1 John iii. 2. This classic passage sets before us the realization of the original promise involved in man's creation—a realization that could come only in the form of a process of development. As the natural world, leading up to and includ-

*The Destiny of Man, pp. 110-112.

ing the creation of man, was not made at one stroke but came gradually into existence, the idea of creation which existed eternally in the mind of God being realized in the ages through a concrete process, so man was not placed in Paradise by one act, in the fullness of his powers, in developed moral stature, in life communion with God, as Minerva leaped forth in panoply from the head of Jupiter. The realization of the idea of man required a process which continued through the ages, yea, is even now in process of fulfillment, for "it is not yet made manifest what we shall be." It is only by the careful study of this process in its different stages that we get an insight into the relation between man and God, or between humanity and divinity as this relation is developed in the Word of God. There are especially three points, constituting epochs in the historical movement to which we have referred, that call for special attention. These are 1st, the Creation of Man, 2d, the Incarnation, involving Man's Redemption, 3d, the Glorification of Man.

I. The creation of man is the completion of the natural creation, in the sense that now, when man has entered the world, the way is open for a union, intelligent and free, between the Creator and the creature. The process by which the system of created things is to find its end in God who is its source, is, indeed, not finished, for successive steps and stages are required before that end can be reached. But man is so constituted that he is the centre in which God and the world find their union ultimately realized. As a creature, therefore, man completes the system of created things. At the same time, his nature is such that, looking forward to a course of future development, possibilities entirely beyond the reach of the lower orders of life slumber in his bosom. In one sense, accordingly, his creation is the same with, and in another sense, entirely different from, that of the other creatures which preceded him. Let us consider the resemblance and the difference.

First, we have to do here with an act of creation. This is to be carefully distinguished from two other processes with which it is sometimes confounded, viz. : *emanation* and *generation*. In

the former the substance produced is the same as that from which it is produced. The process, for it cannot properly be called an act, is involuntary and the result, by the outflow of substance, a necessary consequence which follows from the nature of the substance itself and the laws to which it is subject. This does not exclude variety and development, as presupposed in the pantheistic conceptions of the universe, and as illustrated in the natural world by the production either of connected series of animals and plants, or of, apparently, new individuals, as where reproduction takes place by gemmation or fission. But in all these cases the same substance is transfused through the whole extent of its manifestation, and the difference or variety that appears is due only to a difference in the degree of development.

In the latter, that is in *generation*, we have to do with an act which may be said to be free or voluntary, but the result is not free but necessary; that is to say, the thing generated is of the same nature and the same substance as that by which it is generated (using the term generation not in its chemical but in its biological sense), making due allowance for the modifications produced by the different factors in the process, and by environment.

Now in distinction from all this, creation is a free act, the calling into existence of that which as yet is not, and the giving of a nature and constitution according to the will of the Creator. The act is voluntary and the result is free, that is it depends upon the will of the subject what and how the object is to be. This does not mean that the act is arbitrary or willful; it depends upon the character of the Creator which enters into the motive, and the motive intelligently shaped into a thought or idea controls the will, so that the act, at last, is only the outward expression of the character or nature of the subject. But this is done in the way of intelligent freedom, not under the control of blind necessity.

The whole creation, then, is the free expression of a thought of God. From one point of view we may say that it is neces-

sary; for it is the nature of God to communicate Himself. But the purpose is conceived in love and executed in wisdom, resting upon the eternal Logos as its ground and foundation, and realized in time through His agency. If the motive is love (or take the other view that the motive is to glorify the Creator), it must return again in its final and complete development, to God who is its end, as well as its source. This involves an order of things leading up to man as the head and lord of the natural world, that through him the end in view may be reached.

It matters not, so far as the idea of creation is concerned, by what particular method the different orders of creatures were called into existence. Each is the embodiment of a thought of God, and as God thinks logically, that is according to the laws of thought and wills in harmony with the nature of His being, there is no doubt an intimate relation and interdependence of His thoughts, all constituting a unity and leading to a conclusion as strictly as a demonstration in Euclid. One step conditions and involves the next; and it makes no difference whether the relation is simply in the mind of the Creator or whether the mode of operation is such that creation begins in the establishment of an order of existence, such as matter and its forces, in and through which by the immanent energy of the Creator the plan of the whole is wrought out, making room for the coming in of higher potences and new factors, always "in the fullness of time," until the whole process is complete. The latter, to us, seems by far the more reasonable supposition.* But in either case, the act or process of creation is the bringing forth of that which previously was not, and that which for its nature and qualities depends ultimately upon the will of the Creator.

It is to be observed next that the creature does not, by the act of creation, become absolutely self-existent or independent of the Creator. "For there is not a moment in the life of the

* See Illingworth: "The Incarnation and Development," in *Lux Mundi*, p. 162.

creature, in which God is not to be regarded as the One who preserves His creature, streaming through it with His all-pervasive power, and giving it life, and breath, and all things.* "In Him all things consist," means not only that all things have their centre in God, their "standing together," but also that, except in Him they would have no existence at all. Every power, every movement, every operation is by the power and energy of God. It is difficult to explain or illustrate precisely what this means, and every analogy we may use for that purpose must be faulty and imperfect. But we are to remember that the creature is a reality not a shadow; and yet it is what it is, and does what it does only through the ever-present, ever-working power of God in and through it. God's presence and activity may, perhaps, not inaptly, be conceived of, like the light of the sun as affecting our vision, which flashing forth from the great luminary streams through vacant space invisible and without effect. So there may be bodies in space, gaseous or solid, which if left to themselves are as though they were not, so far as our eyes are concerned. But when the light falls upon them they become manifest. The ray of light that enters the room through a slit in the shutter may be traced by the illuminated motes, otherwise invisible which float in the air. To produce vision, the two are necessary. The light does not illumine itself; the body does not manifest itself. The shape of the body determines the illuminated space before us, and yet the illumination itself comes from the light. This is an external relation and a mechanical conception, and it only faintly represents the deeper, internal, dynamic relation between the creature and the Creator. What we mean is that God works in and through every creature which He has made, according to its nature and rank in the system of created things. He works in the attraction and repulsion of the particles of matter, in the plastic power of the plant and animal, in the sensibility, intelligence and volition of man, filling every creature according to the measure of its capacity and power.

* Martensen's Dogmatics, § 115. Acts xvii, 25. Ps. civ. 29, 30.

This may serve to show in what respect the creation of man resembles that of other creatures, but we must not overlook the fact that there is also a difference. This difference holds not so much in the process of creation, as some have thought, because of the apparent stress laid on the inbreathing of the Spirit on the part of the Creator, by which "man became a living soul,"* as it does in the nature and constitution of the creature. We have said that every creature is the actualization of a thought of God. This is true also of man; but in this case the thought is different from the others in that it is not a link, but the end of the chain, and man is made in the image and likeness of God. The likeness of God, we think, means three things: 1st, the endowment of reason and will; 2d, the gift of purity and innocence to be actualized as holiness and righteousness; 3d, the possibility of immortality, to be actualized as everlasting life in communion and fellowship with God. But still, man is a creature, and he lives and moves and has his being in God. Whatever he is or does is by the immanent power of the Creator, whose activity now enters the higher sphere of consciousness and freedom, manifesting itself there as God's power, but according to the character of the man, and the plane of his vocation, capacity and aspiration. Thus man is a person, for the activity is now centered in the *ego*, the stream of divine energy flowing through man (*Deus nos personat*), so that even in the natural man, in the culture and civilization of the world, the works of human genius so called, there is an inworking of a divine power. This is the meaning of the inbreathing of the Spirit, by which the life of the human spirit is quickened and maintained. God can work as natural force in mere matter, as animal instinct in the animal soul; but the free, conscious life of the spirit requires a new, a higher form of existence, upon which God's own image is stamped, and which is to develop into God's own character of holiness, righteousness and love. As man is thus constituted, he is, looking backward, the lord or sovereign of

* On this subject see Dr. Gast: "Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit of Man." *Ref. Quar. Rev.*, July, 1879.

the earth in the sense that he exercises dominion over nature; and, looking forward, he is, both as the high-priest of nature, and as a moral agent, to develop into a condition in which all the possibilities of his nature are realized in perfect communion and fellowship with God.

We purposely say, "are to be realized," for it must be borne in mind that the full idea of man could not be realized in the mere act of creation. We say it with all reverence, there are certain things which God cannot create, viz., concrete morality and freedom, or character as the result of conduct or the determination of the human will. God makes man with the capacity to become moral and free; but he can become such only through a process by which his life is made to conform freely to the law of love. Now full communion with God, life communion, is possible only where God works in man through his (man's) moral nature, and therefore presupposes the formation of moral character on the part of man. In proportion as this is formed and developed is man lifted up and God brought down until the two meet in perfect union. In other words, the *idea of man* is perfectly realized only in the *ideal man*, that is the *God-man*, or God incarnate in human nature. This was not possible, we have said, in the mere act of creation; and we know it was not realized in Paradise because of the fall and the abnormal development of man. Man did not, could not, at once, eat of the Tree of Life; and when he had tasted of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, the way was barred, and he was driven out of Eden.

Let it, however, not be supposed that we undervalue or overlook what was involved in man's creation. We fully believe that he was intended to be a child of God in the full sense of the word as implying not only similarity or likeness, but also communion of life in every part of his nature. "In humanity, made after the Divine Image, it was the intention of God that the Spirit should find His chiefest joy, building the edifice of a social life in which nature was to find its crown and justification; a life of conscious and free sonship, in which the gifts of

God should be not only received, but recognized as His, and consciously used in willing and glad homage to the Divine Giver, in reverent execution of the law of development impressed by the Divine Reason, in the realized fellowship of the Blessed Spirit of knowledge and love." . . . "Our race was created for conscious fellowship with God, for sonship, for the life of spirit. And it is just in this department, that its failure has been most conspicuous."* Originally before the blessed promise could be realized in its fullness, man was overshadowed and surrounded, yea pervaded by the presence of God, to commune with Him according to the measure of man's capacity which was to enlarge continually with the development of his moral life. And even after the fall man was not left in utter darkness. There is not only the promise, and the gracious economy of divine revelation, but there is beside that, where the voice of revelation is not heard, a whispering of the Spirit, and an echo in the depths of the human soul which is a reminiscence of man's primitive state, a fact which Wordsworth poetically expresses in these words:

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
 The Soul that rises with us, our life's star,
 Hath had elsewhere its setting,
 And cometh from afar;
 Not in entire forgetfulness,
 And not in utter nakedness,
 But trailing clouds of glory do we come
 From God who is our home;
 Heaven lies about us in our infancy!"†

Thus we learn, from the testimony of our nature as it now is, as well as from the revelation made to us concerning man's original estate how much is involved in the creation of man, how close was the relation established in this way between humanity and the Deity, and what possibilities of greater good and more intimate communion that relation contained.

* C. Gore, "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration." *Lux Mundi*: 266.

† Intimations of Immortality.

II. But we get a still clearer insight into this relation when we turn to the incarnation, and the redemption of man. As soon as we come to consider the economy of grace and salvation, although the fact of sin and alienation from God is painfully evident, we find expressed, both in the Old and New Testament, a depth and tenderness of love, a yearning of God after the heart of man which sets the relation between the two in a very striking light. We have first the promise, then the covenant, after that the law and the prophets, each of them bringing to view in clearer light successively the relation between God and man, until, in the fullness of time, the two are made one and life and immortality are brought to light by Jesus Christ through the gospel. (2 Tim. 1: 10.) Here atonement is made for sin, the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile is broken down, the love of God has free course, and we all are children of one common Father. We are children of God, however, not simply because we are bought to be His, redeemed by Christ Jesus, however precious is the truth that "He hath purchased the Church with His own blood." (Acts 20: 28.) Nor yet are we children because we have imputed to us His righteousness or are made pure and holy by faith in Jesus Christ. We are children, sons, of God, because in Christ we "become partakers of the divine nature" (1 Pet. 1: 4), and in the regeneration come to be of the same kin or kindred with Him.

While, therefore, we recognize the great truth that the Lord Jesus Christ, "when the fullness of time was come, came down from heaven, and became man, for us men and for our salvation," we regard the incarnation not simply as a means or contrivance by which the Son of God could die for the sins of the world. It is rather the fulfillment of the promise lodged in the very constitution of man, the coming down of God to meet the upward movement of nature in man, a movement which rests in and is carried forward by God's eternal counsel and working, that His image in man should be perfectly realized. The incarnation is not an afterthought. It is not a turning back to

begin anew a movement which had failed in the beginning. But it is a real advance on the original condition of man, a realization of the idea of man in the ideal man by a positive union between God and man. This, as a matter of course, involves a re-heading of the race, a second Adam, a new creation. It is at once the lifting up of humanity into a new relation which involves all the sons of the first Adam, and also a source of spiritual energy or power by which men are born anew into the kingdom of heaven and made members of Christ. This was not possible at first nor immediately after the fall. It became possible only after a process of moral and religious development. God could not become incarnate in an ox or a fish or an ibis. He could not abstractly or suddenly descend from heaven to take up his abode in man. There is a vast difference between the supposed *avatar* of the pagan systems, and the incarnation of the gospel. The one is incongruous, absurd and impossible; the other is normal, rational and necessary. Given man, made in the image and likeness of God, and union between God and man must follow in the normal development of man's moral and religious nature. Given fallen man, and the whole history of the race through the Old Testament dispensation, like Israel wandering through the wilderness into the Promised Land, is necessarily required to produce as its flower and fruit a Virgin Mary before the Only-begotten of the Father can tabernacle in human flesh.

Rev. J. R. Illingworth in "The Incarnation and Development," *Luz Mundi*, p. 153-4, speaking of the development of doctrine by the great thinkers of the early Church, says: "The identity of Him who was made man and dwelt among us, with Him by whom all things were made and by whom all things consist; His eternal pre-existence as the reason and the Word of God, the Logos; His indwelling presence in the universe as the source and condition of all its life, and in man as the light of his intellectual being; His resurrection, His ascension,—all these thoughts were woven into one magnificent picture, wherein creation was viewed as the embodiment of the Divine ideas, and

therefore the revelation of the Divine character; manifesting its Maker with increasing clearness at each successive stage in the great scale of being, till in the fullness of time He Himself became man, and thereby lifted human nature, and with it the material universe to which man is so intimately linked; and triumphing over the sin and death under which creation groaned and travailed, opened by His resurrection and then by His ascension vistas of the glorious destiny prepared for His creatures before the world was. '*Factus est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse quod est ipse.*' (IRENÆUS.)"

Rev. Dr. R. W. Dale of Birmingham, Eng., at the recent International Congregational Council, in London, speaking of "the Divine Life in Man," said: "I have said that this life, according to the Divine will and purpose, has been made the inheritance of the race. As the incarnation is no afterthought of the Divine mind occasioned by the entrance of sin into the world, neither is the gift of eternal life in Christ a mere expedient for recovering men from the power of sin. That man should live his life in the power of the life of the eternal Son was included in the Divine idea of man. This was the perfection to which according to the original constitution of our nature we were destined. Through sin we have all fallen short of the glory of God, missed, forfeited the transcendent honor, righteousness and blessedness for which we were created; but it remains true that we were created in Christ Jesus, and through the infinite grace of God and the power of Christian redemption all that was possible to us through our creation may yet be recovered."

III. Although the incarnation is the realization of the ideal man in the organic union of God and man, it is not yet the end of the process by which man attains to his complete and perfect dignity and glory. As in the life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ there was a progressive manifestation of the power and glory of the Godhead as His humanity itself developed, which became complete in His resurrection and glorification, so in man, too, there is a process of growth which only finds its

completion beyond the grave. There is another and higher stage of development, the *glorification of man*, which is required in order to the full fruition of human life in its relation to God as its fountain or source. This part of the subject is confessedly difficult, because it lies beyond the boundary of our present knowledge and experience, and we have only glimpses of the King's Country and its inhabitants as from a far-off shore, or hear faint notes of the music of that realm as they float across the waters and full upon our enraptured ears. But we have some indications of the magnitude and the significance of the change which, by the working of the grace of God, is to take place in us and in the whole Cosmos, when God shall be all in all.

First of all we have the example of our Lord Jesus Christ, and then the inspired teachings of the apostles and of the apocalypse. With the time at our disposal we can only refer to a few points bearing on this aspect of our subject.

In the incarnation, we have said, the human becomes the organ or medium through which the divine finds expression or manifestation, and at every stage of development the divine manifestation is commensurate with the human capacity to receive and express the glory of the divine. *These two are intended for each other*, and what normal humanity is capable of, is manifest in the transfiguration, where the Lord appeared to the eyes of the disciples all glorious and bright, far beyond the power of human tongue to portray, or the heart of man in its present condition to conceive. Again we see what change the Lord's body had undergone in the resurrection, and how, after the glorification He appeared to St. Paul. Does not all this indicate that through the glorification, the human becomes the full and adequate medium through which the divine finds expression? If now, we take the words of St. John already quoted: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him, for we shall see him even as he is," what a flood of light they shed upon our future condi-

tion, and the relation of man to God when the goal of human aspiration shall have been reached!

This condition involves, first, what we usually express by the term rest. But it is more than the mere negative conception;* While sin is eliminated and the antagonisms of the present life are removed, all imperfection of striving and attainment is done away with, and all the powers of man are exerted in full, free, and harmonious activity. Secondly, all the powers of our human nature are heightened and perfected, so that man attains to the full dignity of the knowledge, power, and glory of which his nature is capable. Thirdly, all this is but in order to the perfected idea of society which involves perfect communion and fellowship between God and man, and between man and man as all bound together in a common brotherhood, because all are sons of a common Father.

It would seem to follow then, as the result of our inquiry, that the relation of humanity to divinity rests upon the fact that man is made in the image and likeness of God, and that this relation finds its full expression and realization in the idea of sonship. From all eternity, the Son, generated in the bosom of the Father, is the type of our nature which is to be realized in time by a process which begins with the natural creation, ripens into the incarnation, and comes to its full development and completion in the glorification of humanity when time shall be no more. From this point of view we may say that we have the true type of all fatherhood in God. But sonship, we think, cannot be properly predicated of man except in Christ. It is only when we look to the economy of salvation which has for its center always the incarnation, the revelation of God in human flesh, involving the atonement for sin through the cross of Christ, and the gift of a new life through His resurrection and glorification, that we realize the fatherhood of God, being adopted as sons through Christ Jesus, the only begotten Son. (Eph. 1: 5; John i. 12. Gal. 3: 26). This is the doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism, and we believe that it is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures.

* Martensen, *Dogmatics*, § 290.

It is true, there are a few Scripture passages in which the word child or son, or some term expressive of the family relation is used, where the reference is not directly to sonship in Christ Jesus. Leaving out of consideration now the expression "sons of God" in Genesis and in Job, where the reason for such use is obvious, there are the passages Luke 3: 38 where Adam is called the son of God; Malachi 2: 10. "Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?"; John 11: 52. "And not for that nation only, but that He also should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad;" Eph. 3: 15, "Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." But such cases are exceedingly rare, and in not a single instance does the question turn on the real idea of sonship. It is either the idea of origin simply, or else that of common dependence, or the typical fatherhood of God, that is set forth; and in this way we often, even now, use the words sons and children in a figurative sense. The *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures as a whole with great consistency maintains and expresses the view which we have been trying to enforce.

Man was, therefore, not created a child of God in the full sense of the word and after the fall, through the redemption in Christ Jesus, was adopted again and brought back to the relation which he at first occupied. He was created *to be* a child of God, to come into the full fruition of sonship by a process of moral and religious development by which he would enter into the life of God, and the life of God into him. Sonship means life communion, and this cannot be created, but only realized by a concrete life-process.

I cannot close more fitly than in the words of Dr. Dale: "Man was to find his perfection in sharing the life of the Eternal Son; the Eternal Son was to reveal His own perfection and achieve ours by sharing the life of man. I suppose that the consummate union between man and the Son of God would not have been possible apart from the consummate union effected in the incarnation between the Son of God and man. Even if we had not sinned, I suppose that *He* would have come

to us, in order that *we* might come to *Him*, . . . 'God gave unto us eternal life and this life is in His Son. It is a gift to the world, as Christ is the propitiation for the sin of the world. But it is a free, ethical, spiritual life that is given: and such a life must be actually lived, if a man is to possess it. It cannot be passed into a man like a stream of electric force—the man himself remaining passive. No sovereign act of the divine power can effectively give it, apart from a free consent to receive it. What we call the potency of life, its germ, may be conferred by a divine act; but if the life is to be more than a potency, more than a germ, we must live it. God Himself cannot make thought actually ours, except as *we* ourselves think; nor penitence for sin, except as *we* ourselves are penitent; nor love except as *we* ourselves love."

II.

THE RENAISSANCE AND THE REFORMATION.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, DD. LL.D.,

Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

A paper prepared for the Ninth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Florence, April, 1891.*

RENAISSANCE and Reformation are significant words for two kindred, yet distinct movements of history: the one closes the Middle Age, the other opens the modern Age. Both are not simply past events, but living forces which control our civilization, and have not yet finished their mission. Renaissance, Reformation, Reaction, Revolution, Reconstruction, these are the links in the chain of modern history.

The Renaissance was a revival of classical culture, the Reformation a revival of primitive Christianity. The former was an intellectual and æsthetic movement, the latter a moral and religious movement. The Renaissance drew its inspiration from the poets and philosophers of ancient Greece and Rome; the Reformation, from the Apostles and Evangelists. The Renaissance aimed at the development of the natural man; the Reformation at the renewal of the spiritual man. The Renaissance looked down upon earth, the Reformation looked up to heaven. The Renaissance is the work of Italy, the Reformation is the work of Germany and Switzerland. The Renais-

*This is the full text of the original. In the absence of the author, an Italian translation by the Rev. Giov. Luzzi, was read before the Conference and published in pamphlet form under the title *Il Rinascimento e la Riforma*. Firenze, 1891 (Piazza del Duomo, 27), 29 pp. Extracts from it appeared in many newspapers of Europe and America. The whole proceedings of the Conference will shortly be published by the British Branch of the Alliance in London.

sance prepared the way for the Reformation and furnished the necessary intellectual equipment for it. Erasmus and Reuchlin, Melancthon and Zwingli are the connecting links of the two movements. Without the Renaissance there could have been no Reformation, and the Renaissance is incomplete without a Reformation. For man is a unit, and his intellectual culture and moral character must be developed and perfected in harmony.

I. THE RENAISSANCE.

The Renaissance was born in Florence, the City of Flowers and the Flower of Cities, "the brightest star in star-bright Italy." From Florence it passed to Rome, and from Rome it spread all over Italy and beyond the Alps. Cosimo de Medici and Lorenzo the Magnificent were the chief among the Mæcenases of literature and art. Pope Nicholas V. and several of his successors, down to Leo X. followed their example. Florence gave birth to a brilliant galaxy of poets, statesmen, historians, scientists, architects, sculptors and painters, and yields to no city in the world, except Rome, in wealth of historic reminiscences and treasures of art.

The Renaissance began with Dante, the greatest son of Florence and the greatest Italian poet. His power extends over the civilized world and is growing with the advancing years. A poor exile, he could not eat his own bread, nor ascend or descend his own stairs, but how large is the number of those whom he has fed and taught to descend the steps of his *Inferno* and to ascend the mountain of his *Purgatorio*! His *Divina Commedia*, conceived in 1300—a year noted for the first papal jubilee—is a mirror of the moral universe viewed from the standpoint of eternity, a cathedral of immortal spirits, a glorification of the Christian religion and a judgment on the corruptions of the secularized Church and papacy of his age. It is at once autobiographical, national and cosmopolitan, a song of the Middle Ages, and of all ages, a spiritual biography of man as a lost sinner, a helpful penitent, and a glorified saint.

It is a pilgrimage of the soul from the dark forest of temptation, through the depths of despair, up the terraces of purification, to the realms of bliss. The pilgrimage is conducted under the guidance of natural reason (Virgil), and divine revelation (Beatrice). Dante was and still is a prophet rebuking tyranny and injustice, avarice and pride in high and low places of Church and State, without fear or favor, and pointing to the eternal issues of man's actions. He stands on the transition between the middle ages and modern times. He broke the monopoly of the clergy for learning, and of the Latin language as the organ of scholarship. He proved that a layman may be a philosopher and theologian, as well as a statesman and poet, and that the *lingua toscana* may give expression to the deepest thoughts and emotions, as well as the language of Virgil and Cicero. He proved that one may be a good Catholic Christian, and yet call for a thorough Reformation. If he had lived in the fifteenth century he would have sympathized with Savonarola; in the sixteenth he would have gone half-way with Luther and Calvin; in the nineteenth he would advocate the unity of Italy and the separation of religion and politics, of Church and State, on the basis of equal freedom and independence for both in their different spheres. Such is the power and bearing of his

"sacred poem

To which both heaven and earth have set their hands."

Petrarca and Boccaccio are far below Dante for depth of genius and extent of influence, but they share with him the honor of being the fathers of Italian literature and the promoters of liberal learning. Petrarca, "the poet of love," was also an enthusiast for classical literature, and the pioneer of humanism in the technical sense of the term. He spared no pains and money for the recovery of old manuscripts from the dust of convents. He was the first collector of private libraries of classical authors, and he studied these as a means for intellectual and æsthetical culture. Cicero and St. Augustin were his patron saints.

His friend Boccaccio followed his example in the search for

manuscripts though he is better known as the master of Italian prose, the author of the *Decamerone* and the first biographer and commentator of Dante.

In the fifteenth century the enthusiasm for classical literature and humanistic culture spread with irresistible force through all the cities of Italy and even crossed the Alps as far north as Poland and as far west as England and Scotland. The discovery of the classics was the revelation of a long-forgotten civilization and created as much sensation in the fifteenth century as the discovery of the hieroglyphics and cuneiform inscriptions and the excavations of Troy and Mycenæ did in our age. Italian scholars traveled to Greece and Constantinople in search of Greek manuscripts and translated them into Latin. Greek scholars who left their native land before and after the fall of Constantinople, brought with them the literary treasures of the East. I can only allude to the illustrious names of Salutato, Marsiglio, Bruni, Poggio, Filelfo, Traversari, Valla, Guarino, Aurispa, Chrysoloras, Plethon, Bessarion. To their indefatigable industry and to the liberal patronage of the Medici and Pope Nicholas V, we owe the discovery and collection of the chief writings of ancient Rome and Greece, with valuable translations and comments.

About the same time the art of printing was invented in Germany and soon spread over all Italy to give wings to thought and to preserve literature from another relapse into barbarism.

Now Homer sang the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Virgil, the *Æneid*; Plato and Aristotle taught philosophy; Demosthenes and Cicero delivered orations; Thucydides and Tacitus recited history; all that made Greece and Rome great and prosperous was revived for the instruction and enjoyment of scholars.

The discovery and reproduction of classical literature was followed by the discovery and reproduction of classical art, which revealed the beauty of the human body, as the former had revealed the strength of the human mind. At the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, the masterpieces of Greek sculpture, such as the *Laocoon group*, the

Apollo of the Belvidere, the torso of Hercules, were dug from the ruins of palaces and villas of old Rome, and kindled an enthusiasm for similar achievements.

It was a remarkable coincidence that at the same time there arose those marvellous geniuses, as Ghiberti, Masaccio, Donatello, Brunelleschi, Fra Giovanni Angelico, Fra Bartolomeo, Bramante, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Michelangelo, who produced the greatest works of architecture, sculpture and painting known before or since.

The art of the Renaissance blends the purity and sublimity of the Catholic religion with the charms of classical taste. It achieved its highest and most permanent triumphs in temples of worship, the representations of Christ and his Virgin Mother, Moses and the Prophets, the sufferings and glorification of Christ. Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole regarded art as an act of worship and charity and painted saints and angels on his knees. Raphael's last and greatest work represents the divine-human Saviour soaring high in the air in garments of transparent light, adored by Moses and Elijah, and the three favorite disciples, and shedding the light and peace of heaven over the scene of misery on earth. Truly, "a thing of beauty is a joy forever."

What do we owe to the Renaissance of letters and arts? What is its permanent contribution to the civilization and happiness of mankind? The Renaissance raised Greece and Rome from the dead, recovered and collected the ancient classics, created a taste for the humanities, for literary and artistic culture, produced the national literature of Italy, and the greatest works of art, adorned churches, and filled museums and picture galleries, which will attract admiring visitors from every land to the end of time. The Renaissance destroyed the clerical monopoly of learning and made it accessible to the laity; it emancipated the mind from the bondage of tradition, and introduced the era of intellectual freedom. It substituted for the monastic seclusion from the world the social duty of transforming the world and the institutions which God has founded. It

taught the value of man as man ; and showed the finger of God in reason, in nature and art. Humanism made the literature of Greece and Rome repeat the preparatory service which they had accomplished at the first introduction of Christianity by furnishing the language and the frame-work for its divine contents.

But man is a moral and spiritual as well as intellectual and æsthetic being. And here we must not be blind to the defects of the Renaissance. Some of the first humanists and artists of Italy were sincere and devout Christians. But many of them were indifferent or secretly hostile to religion, while outwardly conforming to its ritual. Not a few were pagans at heart and disciples of Zeno and Epicurus rather than of Peter and Paul. They substituted the worship of beauty for the worship of holiness. The revival of pagan art was to a large extent also the revival of pagan immorality. Savonarola, undazzled by the splendor of Lorenzo's reign, preached with prophetic zeal from the pulpit of San Marco the necessity of a moral reformation, but was publicly burned on the Piazza della Signoria.

The corruption centered at the metropolis of Christendom and culminated in the highest dignitaries of the Church. Alexander Borgia practiced vice as an art and turned the Vatican into a den of prostitution and murder. Julius II. was a warrior rather than a churchman. Leo X. delighted in the chase and in comedies more than in the duties of his high office, and although his saying about "the profitable fable of Christ" is probably a myth, it characterizes the skeptical atmosphere of the Vatican at that time.

When Erasmus, as the literary monarch of his age, visited Rome in 1506, he was charmed with her culture and refinement, her freedom of discourse, the honeyed conversation of her scholars and the magnificence of her arts, but at the same time he was shocked by "the abominable blasphemies," uttered by priestly lips at the papal court. And when Luther, four years later, went to Rome as an humble monk and pilgrim, he visited the tombs of the apostles and martyrs and climbed up the Scala

Santa on his knees, but was horrified by the sight of the prevailing worldliness, frivolity and ill-disguised infidelity of priests who hurried through the mass and were heard to say over the consecrated elements "*Panis es, panis munebis; vinum es, vinum manebis.*" Machiavelli, the great statesman and historian of Florence, asserts from his own observation that "in proportion as we approach nearer the Roman Church, we find less piety," and that "owing to the bad example of the papal court, Italy has lost all piety and religion, whence follow infinite troubles and disorders." Guicciardini, another distinguished historian of Florence, who was secretary and viceregent of the Medicean popes, makes in his "Aphorisms" (1529) the startling confession: "My position at the court of several popes has compelled me to desire their aggrandizement for the sake of my own profit. Otherwise I would have loved Martin Luther myself—not that I might break loose from the laws which Christianity, as it is usually understood and explained, lays upon us, but that I might see that horde of villains (*questa caterva di scellerati*) reduced within due limits, and forced to live either without vices or without power." We have even the contemporary testimony of a pope, Adrian VI., a Dutchman, who was elected after Leo X, as a reforming pope, but reigned less than two years (from Jan. 9, 1522 to Sept 14, 1523). He admitted through his legate, Francesco Chiericati, at the Diet of Nürnberg, March, 1522, "that for some time many abominations, abuses, and violations of rights have taken place in the Holy See; and that all things have been perverted into bad. From the head the corruption has passed to the limbs, from the pope to the prelates; we have all gone astray, there is none that doeth good, no, not one." The Council of Trent, so loudly called for and so long delayed by the policy of the curia, was confessedly convened for the reformation of morals as well as for the settlement of dogmas.

Who can doubt, in view, of these contemporary testimonies of the most competent observers and judges, the necessity of a Reformation?

II. THE REFORMATION.

The Reformation began during the pontificate of the last pope of the Renaissance, who was a cultivated pagan, rather than a Christian, and fairly represented the secularization of the Church, which from a kingdom of heaven had become a kingdom of this world.

It was at first an indignant protest against the sale of indulgences, which degraded religion to an article of merchandise : as had been done by the profane traffickers in the temple at Jerusalem whom the Saviour expelled at the beginning of His public ministry. Leo X. condemned Luther, and the monk answered by burning the pope's bull. This was the fiery signal of separation. Since that time Western Christendom has been divided into two hostile armies.

The Reformation was neither a revolution which destroys but cannot build up, nor a reaction which restores a former state of things without vitality and permanency. It had a positive and a negative side. It was constructive as well as destructive, conservative as well as progressive. It emancipated the half of Europe from the spiritual tyranny of the papacy and cleared away the rubbish of mediæval traditions, which obscured and "made void the Word of God," like the rabbinical traditions of old (Matt. 15 : 6), and which obstructed the access to Christ, the only Mediator between God and man. It brought every believer into direct communion with Christ and His word. This of itself is an inestimable blessing, which can never be surrendered.

The Reformation kindled an unbounded enthusiasm for primitive Christianity; it produced the most faithful and idiomatic versions of the Scriptures, German, Dutch and English, which occupy the position of first classics in modern literature; it enriched worship with a treasury of hymns of faith and praise, which are a perennial fountain of edification and comfort; it taught the supremacy of the Bible in matters of faith and practice, justification by a living and ever-active faith, and

the general priesthood of believers; it secured liberty of conscience and private judgment, which in legitimate development led gradually to full liberty of conscience and public worship within the limits of public order and peace. Protestantism has been a propelling force in modern history and a stimulus to every progress in theology, philosophy, science and politics. Its mission is not yet completed.

The Reformation was so deeply rooted in the necessities of the Church and was so thoroughly prepared that it broke out almost simultaneously in different countries, and marched with irresistible force through Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, Scandinavia, England and Scotland. It was making progress even in Italy and Spain till the middle of the sixteenth century. Pope Paul IV. is reported by Onuphrius to have declared that the only firm support of the papacy in Italy was the Inquisition with its prisons and funeral piles.

Some distinguished scholars and orators of Italy, as Bernardino Occhino of Siena, Pietro Martire Vermigli of Florence, and Pierpaolo Vergerio, bishop of Capo d'Istria and nuncio of two Popes, renounced Romanism and had to flee from the Inquisition. Others who occupied the highest positions, like cardinals Sadoletto, Contarini, Morone, Reginald Pole, favored at least a moral reform, and came very near the fundamental evangelical doctrines of the supremacy of the Bible and justification by faith. Vittoria Colonna, the most cultivated lady of Italy and her greatest poetess, equally illustrious for genius, virtue and piety, together with her friends, Michelangelo, the Duchess of Gonzaga, and the Duchess Renata of Ferrara, were in sympathetic contact with the semi-Protestant reform movement. This distinguished group forms a connecting link between the Renaissance in its best type and the Reformation in its evangelical character. That remarkable little *Trattato utilissimo del beneficio di Gesù Christo*—the work of a monk of Naples, Don Benedetto of Mantova (a pupil of the Spanish nobleman, Valdés) and the poet Flaminio, of Imola,—teaches the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith

and the union of the soul with Christ as clearly and strongly as the writings of Luther, and was spread in many thousands of copies throughout Italy. It was first printed at Venice, 1540, and publicly burned at Naples in 1553.

The Counter-Reformation and the Inquisition extinguished the rising flame of the Reformation in Italy, and at the same time sounded the death-knell of the Renaissance by charging it with immorality and irreligion. The last representative of the philosophical Renaissance was condemned as a heretic and burned on the Campo dei Fiori at Rome; but on the same spot the friends of liberty of thought and speech erected a statue to Giordano Bruno in 1889, three hundred years after his death. What a change! The Renaissance has risen from the dead and is as strong in Italy now as it was four centuries ago. Yea, it is stronger and more widely spread among educated men and women who will not go back from the light and liberty of the nineteenth century to the ignorance and superstition of the dark ages.

III. ITALY AND THE FUTURE.

By repudiating the Renaissance and burning the Reformation, Italy and Spain lost their front rank among the nations of Europe, and reaped the Revolution as a chronic disease. In the sixteenth century, Italy was the most civilized country, and Spain the most powerful monarchy in Europe; while Prussia and England were far behind them and just emerging from the semi-barbarism of the Dark Ages. Now the case is reversed. The same change has taken place in America: the United States and Canada, which are Protestant to the back-bone, have far outstripped the older Catholic settlements of Central and South America.

But in our age Italy has made vast progress, and undergone a political and social regeneration: She has achieved the incalculable temporal blessing of national unity and independence, in spite of the protest and obstruction of the papal hierarchy.

The unification and emancipation of Italy and Germany from the selfish misgovernment of petty tyrants are among the greatest events in the nineteenth century. Many of us remember the time when none but Roman churches were allowed within the walls of Rome, when Protestant Bibles were confiscated at the Custom House, and when the Madaia family was put in prison in Florence for the innocent crime of holding meetings for prayer and reading the Holy Scriptures! Now, religious liberty is established throughout the kingdom of Italy as fully and firmly, we may say, as in England and North America. It was the great Italian statesman Cavour, who spoke the winged word: "A free Church in a free State," as the key to the solution of the vexed question of the relation between the ecclesiastical and civil powers. It is true, the *Statuto fondamentale* of March, 1848, which has since 1870 become the law of all Italy, still recognizes the Roman Catholic Church as the sole religion of the State (*la sola religione del stato*), and gives only toleration to other existing modes of worship (*gli altri culti ora esistenti sono tollerati conformamente alle leggi*); but in point of fact, toleration has become liberty, which is an inalienable right and cannot be taken away. A return to the ages of persecution for conscience' sake is impossible. The Papal Syllabus of 1864, which declares war against civil and religious liberty, is an anachronism, and about as effective as a bull against the motion of the earth, which "still moves." Every Italian may now proudly say, I am no more a Sicilian, or a Neapolitan, or a Lombard, but an Italian citizen, and am free to worship God according to my honest convictions.

What will be the next chapter in the history of Italy? Will she complete her political reform by a religious revival and ecclesiastical reconstruction? No mortal eye can penetrate the future, but one thing is certain: revolutions never go backwards. The past cannot be undone. History, although it does not move in a straight line is yet moving forward, like a sailing vessel, now turning to the right, now to the left, according

to the wind, and is steadily advancing towards the destined harbor. For God is the unerring captain of the ship and makes winds and waves the servants of his omnipotent will.

We cannot expect or wish Italy to become Protestant, but we do hope and pray that she may become evangelical and Christian in the best sense of the term. She will not and ought not to turn the back on her glorious past, to disown the immortal works of her literature and art, to break with her Catholic traditions, and to import a foreign religion which is not congenial to her genius and taste. She wants a religion that will in some way combine the best elements of the Renaissance and the Reformation, with the best features of Catholicism.

The liberals of Italy are dissatisfied with the Church of their ancestors, and have no leaning to the sects of foreigners, but they are not on that account destitute of religion; they have a religion of their own, which will kindle into a flame of enthusiasm when the Spirit of God through some inspired prophets shall blow the breath of life into the dry bones and clothe them with flesh and blood.

There must be a possibility of harmonizing the highest civilization with the highest virtue and piety. There must be a way of reconciling the Protestant, the Catholic, and the Rationalistic rules of authority. The Bible, the Church, and enlightened reason are not necessarily antagonistic. The Bible, as containing the Word of God, is and must remain the supreme rule of faith; the Church of God is and will remain the guardian, propagator and expounder of the Bible; reason, the greatest natural gift of God to man, is the organ by which alone we can understand and appropriate the teaching of the Bible and the Church. These are the ways which lead us to God who is the source of truth. In this threefold light every man must decide for himself what to believe and how to live, according to his conscientious conviction and personal experience. This is the awful responsibility which God has laid upon every rational being made in his image. "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind" (Rom. 14: 5).

IV. ROMANISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

The Roman Catholic Church has been greatly benefited by the Protestant Reformation and forced to an abolition of many abuses. She shows to her best advantage in Protestant countries where she is put on her defense, and feels the impulse of modern life and progress. She is still the largest body of Christendom and nearly equals, numerically, the Greek and Evangelical communions combined. She is the best organized body in the world, and "the prisoner of the Vatican commands with infallible authority an army of priests and monks in five continents. She is backed by inspiring memories, as the *Alma Mater* of the Middle Ages, the Christianizer and civilizer of the Northern and Western barbarians, the Church of the Fathers, the Schoolmen and the Mystics, the Church of St. Chrysostom and St. Augustin, of St. Benedict and St. Francis, of St. Bernard and St. Thomas Aquinas, of Tauler and Thomas à Kempis, of Pascal and Fénelon. She is still full of missionary zeal and devotion, and abounds in works of charity. She embraces millions of true worshipers and followers of Christ, and has the capacity for unbounded usefulness. We honor her for all she has done in the past, and wish her God's blessing for all the good she may do in the future. We do not pray for her destruction—God forbid!—but for her reformation.

On the other hand, Protestantism is by no means perfect in any of its forms. With the great merits we have set forth in the previous section, it has also its defects and is liable by the abuse of individualism to run into sectarian division, rationalism, scepticism and agnosticism. It has, fortunately, never claimed infallibility in any of its numerous confessions of faith, and hence admits of constant progress, rectification and improvement. It ceases to be Protestant, if it ceases to move. Its mission is far from being completed. It has to grapple with problems which lay beyond the horizon of the Reformers, but press themselves upon the attention of the present generation.

Protestantism is bound to investigate and reinvestigate every theological and philosophical problem ; to search and research the Scriptures in the light of modern discoveries and advances in philology, archæology and science ; to harmonize faith and reason ; to grapple with social problems ; to improve the condition of the working classes ; to preach the gospel to every creature, and to bring the Word of God as a lamp of life into every household.

V. THE DUTY OF PROTESTANTS IN ITALY.

Evangelical religion has now fair play in Italy and numbers in a population of thirty millions about 60,000 professors, including the foreign residents. In Rome and in Florence alone, there are about a dozen Protestant congregations, representing nearly as many denominations. Two of these denominations are of native growth (the Waldensian, which is by far the strongest of all, and the Chiesa Liberal) ; the others are of foreign importation and chiefly supported by friends in England and the United States. They all do good in their respective fields of labor, and far be it from us to underrate their usefulness on account of this numerical weakness. The Kingdom of Heaven itself began as small as a mustard seed, and Paul, the prisoner in Rome, was mightier than Nero on the throne.

At the same time we should not be blind to the danger of the centrifugal tendency of Protestantism to excessive individualism and division, which hinders its progress among Catholics brought up in the tradition of a centralized church organization, and unable to discern the essential spiritual unity which underlies the variety of external forms.

There must be liberty in non-essentials, but there ought to be unity in essentials and charity in all things.* Liberty we have

* "*In necessariis unitas, in dubiis (or non-necessariis) libertas, in omnibus caritas.*" A famous motto of irenics usually ascribed to St. Augustin, but dating from a German divine (Meldenius) in the seventeenth century.

as much as we desire, and divisions only too many. Unity and charity are the greatest needs, and the necessary conditions for the success of evangelical missions in any country.

First unity. It is the burden of our Lord's sacerdotal prayer. It is enjoined over and over again in the Epistles. "A house divided against itself cannot stand," says the highest authority. Let the Protestant pastors in Italy unite on the immovable rock which is Christ, and emphasize above all minor differences their common faith by which we all hope to be saved. Let the various denominations come to an understanding, which will prevent jealousy, unnecessary collision and unholy rivalry, and enable them to present a united front to the common foe. Let them remember that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing but a new creature, and faith operative in love. Why then should we be kept apart by minor questions of episcopacy or presbytery, presbytery or independency, immersion or sprinkling, or even by doctrinal differences which in the polemic and scholastic ages of Protestantism roused the scandalous feuds between Lutherans and Calvinists, Calvinists and Arminians, and made the best men pray for deliverance from "the fury of the theologians?"

And as to charity, is it not the queen of Christian graces, the crowning virtue, the bond of perfectness? And should it not go out to our fellow-Christians of the Roman Catholic faith who, after all, believe in the same Father Almighty, the same Divine Saviour, the same Holy Spirit, and expect to be saved by the same blood of atonement?

Let us be frank. There is as much Protestant as Roman bigotry, prejudice and hatred, and it is all the more inexcusable because we profess to occupy a more advanced liberal position. For more than three hundred years Protestants of the radical type have been abusing the pope as Anti-Christ, papists as idolators, and the Church of Rome as the great apostasy and as the synagogue of Satan. Is this courteous, is it charitable, is it Christian? Or is it an ignorant prejudice,

based upon a false interpretation of some obscure passages of Scripture and a perversion of history? At all events what has Protestantism gained, what can it expect to gain, by such bitter antagonism? The converts made by the abuse of Romanism who are worth any thing may be counted on the fingers ; while the number of those who are repelled and alienated by it is beyond calculation. It can only obstruct and put off a reconciliation. If St. Paul on the Areopagus had insulted the Athenians by abusing them as idolaters he would not have made any converts ; but with a master stroke of Christian wisdom and courtesy, he addressed them as over-religious, who unconsciously worshiped "the unknown God," whom he came to preach to them. The best way of refuting error is to preach the positive truth. *Verum est index sui et falsi.* The noblest and surest way of converting an enemy is to show him the love whereby Christ has loved and saved us.

Oh! for a pentecostal effusion of the spirit of love which is better than speaking with the tongues of men and angels, better than the gift of prophecy, greater even and more enduring than faith and hope.

The deepest and strongest tendencies of our age, which by its wonderful inventions almost obliterates the distances of time and space and brings the ends of the earth into instantaneous connection, is not towards division but towards reunion. A task as great as the conversion of the world, and apparently as impossible. But all things are possible with God Almighty. He has great surprises for us in store—reformations purer, deeper, broader, than that of Luther and Calvin ; yea, pentecosts with more flaming tongues than that of Jerusalem. His wisdom and love will bind together what the folly of men has put asunder. He will heal the wounds of Christendom and melt the hearts of the Churches in the sorrow of a common repentance and in the joy of a common forgiveness, and bring once more a beautiful cosmos out of chaos as in the days of creation. The creeds of the militant Churches will be merged into the one creed of Christ, who is the prince of peace and the divine concord of all

human discords. There must and will be one flock and one Shepherd as sure as Christ, who promised it, is the Truth. The sacerdotal prayer must and will be fulfilled, "I in them and thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and lovedst them even as Thou lovedst Me."

III.

A RETROSPECT—1791-1891.*

BY JOHN BLAIR LINN, ESQ.

I HAVE chosen for a theme this evening, a brief retrospect of some incidents gathered casually from the history of the century just now concluded with the past, indicative of our progress in political, social and religious well-being. To the providence and care of Almighty God, under a free constitution and government "of the people, by the people and for the people," we owe our marvellous growth in population and our unparalleled progress in the arts of peace, whereby as a republic we stand to-day in the fore-front of the nations of the earth. With the church and school in the formation of the greatness of the United States of America, freedom in religion has not ended in freedom *from* religion, and equality in law has not ended in independence *of* law.

Prior to 1787 our national *Status* was a confederacy of thirteen colonies. "Thirteen staves and ne'er a hoop will never make a barrel," said homely wit. But in 1787 the convention at Philadelphia blotted out the codes of the eastern hemisphere reeking with blood and stained with pillage, and established in their stead the Constitution of the United States of America: and September 2, 1790, a new Constitution was adopted for Pennsylvania; a constitution deservedly considered as an admirable model for a representative state; securing force to the government and freedom to the people.

In 1791 then, our republic was a young empire emerging

* An address delivered before the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall College, June 17, 1891.

into an organized existence; a federal government scarcely established, suspended on the slender thread of opinion. Fourteen states, commencing with Delaware and ending with Vermont, had adopted the Federal constitution, and with a population of four millions scattered along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Georgia and as far west as Kentucky, the struggle for existence as a free government began.

In this year of grace 1891, forty-four States "are with a most indissoluble tie forever knit." States not of contracted boundaries as Delaware and Vermont, but for the most part proportionate in territory to Kansas, which is larger in area than New England, New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland combined. Over sixty-two millions of people, some from nearly every country on the globe,* welded together by the force and strength of our civilization, inhabit the vast domain of the United States, which measure ten-fold our possessions of 1791. Over this vast domain our laws and our government are omnipotent; the spirit of our people seems to animate the whole western continent, and the monetary credit of the United States is above that of any other nation.

We owe the preservation of our immense territory, intact, to the foresight and diplomatic ability of our statesmen. Early in 1780, while Louisiana was yet a province of Spain, Benjamin Franklin wrote John Jay, "I would not sell a drop of the waters of the Mississippi. A neighbor might as well ask me to sell my street door."

When we look at the map of our country it suggests the thought of one people and one nationality. It is formed physically for the seat of one magnificent republic. The Allegheny flows into the Ohio, the Ohio into the Mississippi, and "the father of floods must go unvexed to the sea." Separate sovereignties could not exist here. History tells us that. In 1755 England held our coast, and France endeavored to secure the banks of the Ohio and the shores of the Missouri, but on

* Ninety-seven nationalities among us, it is said.

the immortal plains of Abraham, the lilies of France went down before the cross of St. George.

There were no natural boundaries between our original States. Our State lines were made in conveyancer's offices, and depended on the patents of kings and the charters of companies, who knew nothing of the bounds and extent of the country they were parcelling. They were run by the surveyor's compass through rivers and over the tops of mountains and the states could not remain divided, but must have some great embracing bond. Time wove this band and the constitution of 1787 girded State sovereignties with that band in the memorable declaration; "We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States of America;" and history has written our government ordained of God.

When therefore the Secessionists lifted arms against such a government, they inaugurated an unholy and unchristian insurrection, and the men who fell at South Mountain, Antietam and Gettysburg, in a never dying appeal in favor of right and religion, defending the soil of their native State from the inroad of rebel invaders, were as truly martyrs as the early Christians or the Huguenots, "who kissed the flames that drank their blood and chased their souls to Heaven." History has enrolled Meade's grand master-stroke for the union among the world's great battles, and the statue of Gen. John F. Reynolds stands gloriously upon the watch-tower on Cemetery Ridge, guarding as it were the bivouac of his compatriot dead.

We cannot overestimate the rare genius of the statesman, Abraham Lincoln; the indomitable energy of that man of iron, the great war secretary, Edwin M. Stanton, or the brilliant services of Grant, Sherman, Thomas, Sheridan, Hancock, our own Hartranft* and others. A fitting eulogy of their worth

* Gov. Hartranft was a member of the Sophomore class of 1850-51, Marshall College.

would crowd too much the pages of this retrospect. I must, however, refer to one still living, who has thrown his administrative fame far forward into the future. I recall the dark days of 1863, when the war and political machinations threatened to bring in their wake a despairing close of our splendid dreams of re-union. It was then that our war governor in a speech at Elmira, New York, with eloquence, seldom if ever equalled, fired anew the patriotic spirit of our people with the declaration; "the war *shall* be waged until it ends in the re-establishment of this great government—the late election in Pennsylvania demonstrated the fidelity of that great commonwealth to the cause of the country. My duty is clearly demonstrated and I will lash the great commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the National Government in its struggles for existence, and under the providence of God will give my life and all that is in me to maintain the confidence of Pennsylvania and to demonstrate the patriotism of that great State." I proclaim it to the honor of our State, that with Andrew G. Curtin in the gubernatorial chair, holding aloft the ægis of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, over two hundred and fifteen battle flags came back stained with blood, tattered and torn by bullets, *but never disgraced* in any battle for the Union.

The roll of that war's dead contains the name of Rev. John R. Kooker, a minister of the German Reformed church, who pursued his literary and theological studies at Mercersburg. His ardent temperament and overflowing patriotism could not brook our country's danger. He fell within sight of the late governor Hartranft and myself gallantly leading his company on the disastrous field of Fredericksburg. "They never fail who die in a good cause." Slavery was abolished, the union was preserved and the spirit of the Declaration of Independence was made universal by the fundamental law of the land. With the wonderful prosperity of our re-united country, in the splendor of this evening sky of the nineteenth century, we pray God our nation may go on through all the years to come a praise and joy of the whole earth; so that all who shall look

upon it may be able to say "Truly God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved."

Whatever may have been written in depreciation of the enterprise of our own commonwealth "the sleeping giant," as Dr. Nevin was wont to call our State; it is certain that Pennsylvania took the initiative of all sister States in public improvements. The documents are extant to prove that the United States are indebted to Pennsylvania for the first introduction of turnpikes and canals to the public attention. In 1791, actual commencement was made in Pennsylvania of projects which have resulted in the connection by turnpikes, canals and railroads of every important part of our vast country, and great liberality has always marked the career of Pennsylvania in public improvement.

A career, to speak accurately, not commenced, but resumed under the constitution of 1790, with the Act of April 18, 1791, making large appropriations for the improvement of rivers and roads. Then came the resolution of September 27, 1791, which inaugurated the turnpike from Philadelphia to Lancaster, followed by the Act of September 29, 1791, authorizing the incorporation of a company to open a canal from the Schuylkill to the Susquehanna. The turnpike was commenced in 1792, and finished in 1794, sixty-two miles in length, at a cost of \$465,000; and under the Act of April 10, 1792, authorizing the opening of a canal between the Schuylkill and the Delaware, the spade was set in the river bank at Norristown to excavate the first public canal in the United States.

Prior to 1791, transportation of iron, goods, &c., was made on pack horses, and in 1784, the cost of transportation from Philadelphia to Erie was \$249 per ton. The crank for the first saw-mill built in Ohio was carried by pack-horses over the mountains in 1789. The first wagon load of merchandize taken over the Allegheny mountains was hauled from Hagerstown, Maryland, to Brownsville, Pennsylvania, in 1789, by John Hayden, the discoverer of iron ore in Fayette county: distance one hundred and forty miles, cost three dollars per

hundred, and the time consumed in the trip one month. When General Benner established his iron works in Nittany Valley, now Centre county, in 1793, he transported his iron on horse-back to Pittsburgh, at a cost of \$75 per ton. The pack horses carried the bars of iron crooked over and around their bodies, and barrels and kegs were hung on each side of the animals.

As late as 1817, it cost one hundred and forty dollars to move a ton of freight from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, distance three hundred and eighty-five miles. The Pennsylvania Railroad company now carries a ton between the same points for from two dollars and thirty cents to three dollars and eight cents. In 1817, it cost seven dollars to transport one hundred pounds of dry goods from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, now the lowest rate is thirteen cents, the highest thirty-nine cents.

On the 16th of April, 1834, the main line between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, consisting of canals, Portage Railroad and Columbia railroad (the latter being the last link) was finished. After that freight occupied eight days in transit and cost one dollar per hundred, the passenger time between these cities was three days and nineteen hours, and the ticket alone cost fifteen dollars. As late as 1837, an English traveler remarks it took him forty-six hours to travel from Pittsburgh to Erie. Now freight is transferred from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh in twenty-four hours, passengers in nine hours and ten minutes; fare nine dollars. The first Act passed by any Legislature in America, for the construction of a railroad for public use, was passed by the Legislature of Pennsylvania and signed by Governor Hiester, on the 31st of March, 1823. This act authorized the building of a railroad from Philadelphia to Columbia. Ten years afterward the first successful locomotive made in Philadelphia, and the best one that had been made in the United States, was placed on the Philadelphia, Germantown and Norristown Railroad, by M. W. Baldwin, of Philadelphia. It ran a mile in less than a minute.

The first locomotive with a train of cars attached that came into Harrisburg, was run from Middletown, in September,

1836. It took thirteen years to stretch the railroad to Lewistown, sixty miles west of Harrisburg. Four years after it reached the Portage road one mile east of Hollidaysburg, and on the 15th of February, 1854, communication was established by the Pennsylvania Railroad with Pittsburgh, distance three hundred and fifty seven miles. To crown the achievements of Pennsylvania enterprise, in June, 1876, the Pennsylvania Railroad company ran a train from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from New York to San Francisco, three thousand three hundred and seventeen miles in less than three days and one-half, running from New York to Pittsburgh with a single stop.

In 1791, the report of Alexander Hamilton on the expediency of encouraging manufactures in the United States was attracting attention throughout the land. Of iron, he says, the manufactures are more extensive than generally supposed; its average price eighty dollars per ton. Of wool there was then only one brand that could be said to have arrived at maturity; the making of hats. He adds that a promising essay toward the fabrication of cloths, cassimere and other woollen goods is going on at Hartford, Connecticut. In 1891, the merits of the McKinley bill are being discussed through the manufacturing world, while the iron furnaces of the United States are producing larger quantities of iron than the furnaces of Great Britain, while the advantage of quality in the material and the capital invested in manufactures runs into the column of billions.

On the 17th of April, 1790, Benjamin Franklin, whose name adorns our college, died. Philadelphia then had its daily newspaper, and such towns as Carlisle and Pittsburgh their weekly sheets of twelve by eighteen inches filled with foreign news. Now there are seventeen thousand newspapers published in the United States, some of them with agents and correspondents in every quarter of the globe. In several instances the expenditures of a single newspaper for publication amount to six hundred thousand dollars yearly. Among the most valuable newspaper properties of our country is that of the Philadelphia

Ledger, conducted by a man of unbounded energy and rare discretion, with business talent that cannot be surpassed. At the close of a century since Franklin's death we in Pennsylvania can boast that the mantle of "the apostle of common sense," Benjamin Franklin, has fallen upon the philanthropic, conservative, Christian citizen, George W. Childs, who has shown to the world that a successful business can be established on the basis of purity of the press, observation of the Sabbath, good feelings, good principles and the honorable obligations of good citizenship.

Passing from considering our progress in political and physical well-being to glance at the improvement in the treatment of our fellow-creatures; the phase of advance during the century in the management of the insane and criminal classes deserves notice and commendation. One hundred years ago the wild beast theory of insanity had succeeded the diabolical possession idea of the Middle Ages. Iron cages, chains, clubs and starvation were considered the only fit instrumentalities to dominate menageries of human beings, where criminals and insane were alike confined. Then the abyss which opened between those classes and ordinary humanity was too deep and wide for any sympathetic imagination to span. The insane especially were looked upon with a cruel blending of repulsion, personal fear and despair of any method of control except that of physical coercion. As late as January, 1843, when Miss Dix presented her famous memorial to the Legislature of Massachusetts, everywhere over the United States "insane persons were confined, in cages, closets, cellars, stalls, chained naked, beaten with rods and lashed into obedience."

But the day came in our land when such reformers as Dr. Channing, Horace Mann, Dr. S. G. Howe, Dr. Woodward and others, insisted on the presence in human nature, even among its most degraded types, of germs at least of rationality and personal accountability capable of endless spiritual development. Then appeared upon the scene the most useful and distinguished woman America has yet produced, Miss Dorothea L

Dix. She did not proceed to speculate, but sounding as it were all the depths of human misery, embodied Channing's fervid assistance in action, and consecrated her life to the relief of human suffering. She brought herself abreast with the most advanced thought upon the subject and evolved plans which have made the American insane asylums the model asylums of the civilized world. A public benefactor in every fibre of her being, she traveled this country from Nova Scotia to New Orleans, through Europe, and with undaunted fearlessness appeared before Legislatures, Congress, Parliament and Pope. Charles B. Trego, one of the ablest of our former legislators, said, "No man or woman from Maine to Louisiana other than Miss Dix could have passed the bill for the asylum at Harrisburg under the discouraging circumstances with which she had to contend." Devoutly pious, praying always and relying upon her helper in Heaven, her mental and moral powers irresistibly swept before her the Legislatures of more than twenty great States, carried by storm the Senate and House of the United States, won a like triumph in the British Parliament and revolutionized the lunacy legislation of Scotland." Following the wake of her efforts such has been the extraordinary improvement in the treatment of the insane in this country that the proportion of cures in insane hospitals will compare favorably with that of the sick in general hospitals.

Less than a century ago the reputation of Robert Morris, the financier of the Revolution, and the judicial ermine of James Wilson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, could not save them from imprisonment for debt. Now "homestead exemption" secures to every family a little spot of free earth it can call its own, an asylum in time of adversity where mother and children, old age and infancy, may work and live though misfortune may rob them of all else.

In the realm of biblical archæology the discoveries of the last ten years have exceeded those of centuries prior. They prove that the ancient civilized world was a highly literary one long before the age of Moses. By them the arguments against the

authority of the Old Testament on the ground of non-intercourse of ancient nations, their ignorance of each other's language, their low state of civilization, all became the myths, the seemingly profound authors of those arguments would have it, the narratives of the Scriptures embody. The "higher criticism" was lowered by the spade that dug up the historical treasures of Tel El Amarna, and clay tablets now interpret the fourteenth chapter of Genesis and take the place of "the Scientific Method" of interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. A fully inspired and an authoritative Bible still survives; it has stood the test of time and criticism.

Has the Church of Christ retrograded? Let the statistics of Methodism alone answer. Within the narrow limits of the Wesleyan name, Methodism in all lands now counts 25,000,000 adherents. It has its conferences even in China; and its influence has been as great beyond the lines of its founder as within them. The *London Times*, referring to the late centenary of Methodism, says "It is more significant for the gradual absorption which the last hundred years has witnessed, of the essential spirit of Wesley's teaching into the common religious life and social effort of the community, than it is remarkable for the expansion of Methodism proper throughout the religious world." When John Wesley died March 2, 1791, there were fifty-seven thousands of Methodists in America; in 1891 there are four million nine hundred and eighty thousand two hundred and forty. And from the Wesleyan Society have proceeded streams of pious influence that have moulded the character of our community all along the line of American emigration from the banks of the Hudson to where the echo of the woodman's axe dies away amid the surges of the Pacific.

Is the command "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature" neglected? I answer there has been for the last thirty years in Thibet a Moravian missionary and his wife whose nearest post-office is fourteen days' journey from their station. I gladly instance the world-embracing missionary spirit of the Moravian church. Its standard floats in Alas-

ka and Nyassa land; brethren who carried away by their adoration of Him who made the great atonement by going like a lamb to the slaughter, preached and sang ceaselessly of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; whose standards were emblazoned with the Paschal Lamb passant with the banner of victory suspended from the cross of the resurrection. The missionary polity of the Moravian church "runs glittering like a brook in the open sunshine" all through our early annals of Pennsylvania. The long journeys of their pioneer missionaries over wild mountains, through forest and swamp, along "the warriors' path," from camp to camp, their toils, their hardships, their labors for the Master among generations now dead and gone, are recorded on a leaf that will never fade, and some day the book will be opened: "for God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

Every interest that enriches life is linked with the Sabbath-day; the priceless boon of a weekly cessation of toil is a gift of the church to the world.

"Oh day most calm, most bright!
The week were dark but for thy light."

Has reverence for the sanctity of the Sabbath altogether departed? I answer, the last Legislature of Pennsylvania refused to repeal the Sunday law of 1794; and we have a Governor of whom I am proud to say he has declared that "the American Sabbath is the bulwark of the American Nation."

Turning our attention to the history of the Reformed Church in the United States, we have abundant reason for devout thankfulness to the Great Head of the Church for its growth and spread especially during the last quarter of the century now gone. By the efforts of Rev. Michael Schlatter, all honor to his memory, the Reformed churches in this country were consolidated and an ecclesiastical organization known as "The Coetus," formed under the patronage of the Synods of Holland;

convening for the first time, September 29, 1747, in Philadelphia. The Coetus numbered thirty-one members, including elders.* The proceedings of Coetus were reported to the Synods of Holland, and no action could be final without their approval.

In 1783, Rev. J. W. Weber, the pioneer of the western ministry of the Reformed Church, crossed the Alleghenies and became pastor of the churches then organized in Westmoreland county; and in 1788, Rev. F. L. Herman and Rev. George Troidenier, the last ministers sent by the Synods of Holland, arrived in America.

In 1785, at Coetus held at Reading, using the language of Dr. C. Z. Weiser,† “the first and tonic note to the founding of a seminary was struck by Rev. John H. Helffrich, who matured and presented a plan with a view of conciliating the Synods of Holland.” It was an indistinct streak of the dawn of independence of the fostering Synods. The Coetus disapproved of the movement, but Mr. Helffrich was elected President of the succeeding Coetus at Philadelphia, in 1786, and “the two parties fell into ranks and files, the Coetus and the Synod men.”

In 1791, at a Coetus held in Lancaster, Rev. William Hendel presiding, according to Dr. Dubbs,‡ “a resolution equivalent to a declaration of independence was passed. It was in effect that the proceedings of Coetus were to be sent to the Synods of Holland “merely as a matter of courtesy and not for revision.” In 1792 the Coetus directed ministers Pomp and Hendel to prepare a Synodical Constitution, and on the 30th of April, 1793, “The Synod of the German Reformed Church in America,” met in first session in this then Borough of Lancaster, Rev. John H. Winkhaus presiding.

With the closing year of the Coetus three of its conspicuous members were transferred from the church militant to the

* *Mercersburg Review*, 1867, page 252, Dr. Gerhart says there were five ordained ministers and forty-six organized congregations in 1747.

† *Ibid.* 1876, page 20.

‡ Dr. J. H. Dubbs' *Historical Manual*, page 252.

church triumphant: Schlatter, C. D. Weyburg, D. D., and Rev. J. C. A. Helffenstein. The two former born in Switzerland and the latter in the Palatinate, never bartered away their birth-right of freedom but were staunch defenders of the independence of America. Weyburg and Schlatter were both imprisoned for their sympathy for the rights of man, and Helffenstein's fearless sermon on the text, "If God be for us who can be against us?" nerved with joyful patriotism the Pennsylvania soldiery on their departure for the field of battle.

According to Dr. Gerhart,* the Coetus at its dissolution had on its rolls only twenty-two ministers and about one hundred and fifty congregations. "What hath God wrought?" After the circuit of a century, the ministers of the Reformed Church in the United States number eight hundred and forty-six; its congregations fifteen hundred and seventy; its membership, confirmed and unconfirmed, \$14,073. When in 1793, the Synod became an independent body, governed by its own laws and sustained from its own resources, it had no theological seminary, no academy or classical school or Sabbath-schools; in 1891 the Reformed Church in the United States has three theological seminaries, if we include the one at Sendai, Japan; it has Heidelberg University at Tiffin, Ohio, Franklin and Marshall, Mercersburg, Palatinate and Ursinus Colleges in Pennsylvania; Allentown Female Seminary, with eight other colleges or collegiate institutions permeating their influence in church and educational lines from North Carolina and Pennsylvania into Kansas and Wisconsin, all equipped with able professors.

For nearly thirty years after the organization of Synod, to the outward observer of the history of the Reformed Church, its condition was not encouraging. The wars of Napoleon cut off emigration from the Palatinate, redemptionary bonds had to be paid off, farms cleared up and homes erected. Stout hearts, hardy frames and untiring industry composed all the capital worth mentioning brought by the emigrant from the Palatinate into the Western World. Always honest and conservative they

* *Mercersburg Review*, 1887, page 252.

rarely purchased any thing they could not presently pay for, and as rarely entered into enterprises they could not see their way to completion. But they brought their religion with them and must have churches and school-houses. This impulse brought about joint ownership, with their Lutheran neighbors, of places of worship, of school houses and churchyards. They lived as neighbors should, worshiped as Christians, and in sympathy stood together around the graves of their departed. With such intercourse denominational distinctions in form of worship and church creed largely disappeared.

Then, again, until 1820, several different catechisms were in common use among the ministers of the Reformed Church to the exclusion of the Heidelberg Catechism, which was and is the spinal column of doctrine of the Reformed Church in these United States, France, Germany, Holland, Bohemia and the world over. The consequent want of unity of doctrine—want of money and perhaps too great love of money acquired by hardships, may be regarded as the upas trees shadowing the growth of the Church in this country for three or four decades after the organization of the Synod. The farewell words of Rev. Just Henry Fries to one of his congregations in Centre County, seem to be applicable in dismissing this period from further consideration: "Once more," cried he, in summing up, "once more money rules the world, ignorance rules Brush Valley, especially the — family; it is running out of their ears; as calves I met with you, as full-grown steers I leave you. Amen!"

Slow and sure to come the era of classes arrived in 1819, in this then one year old city of Lancaster.* In Synod presided over by Rev. Lewis Mayer, eight classes were formed. Seventy-two years have come and gone, and there are now as many Synods, and the classes number fifty-six. The very next year at Synod held in Hagerstown, Rev. Samuel Helffenstein president, the trumpet call "to your tents, oh Israel," was sounded in a resolution that the Heidelberg Catechism *only*

* The borough of Lancaster became a city in 1818.

should be used by its ministers. The same wide-awake Synod also resolved to establish a theological seminary. The effort, however, failed.

In 1824 the eight classes reported that more than one-fourth were without pastors or regular supplies, showing the urgent necessity for a theological seminary. Ministers of the mettle of Mayer, Wolff and James R. Riley, and elders like Haversteck, Liebhardt, Besore and Heiser, were not discomfited by one or a dozen failures. A seminary was organized in connection with Dickinson College, at Carlisle, on the 11th of April, 1825. Then came, in 1828, the new constitution by the adoption of which the order of Synod of May 12, 1800, in reference to the instruction of ministers, was set aside. The seminary was reorganized at York, Pa., September 11, 1829. Marshall College was founded in 1836, and in 1837 the seminary was transferred to Mercersburg, thence to this city in 1871.

The first class of theological students in the seminary at Carlisle numbered *five*. Now there are more than three hundred students, looking forward to be ministers of Christ, in the seminaries and colleges of the Reformed Church, where the influences are such as to confirm them in the faith of their fathers, make the Word of God the guide of their lives, and where daily prayer recalls the devotion of their homes.

The theological views advanced by the professors in the seminary at Mercersburg were borne on the breeze of controversy all through the world of theological and metaphysical thinkers, and "Mercersburg Theology," attacked and defended with great ability, made a profound impression upon religious thought. As Dr. Dubbs well remarks, "The period of the Mercersburg movement was not a time of retrogression, but of genuine advancement." The reflex, upon the students, of this profound discussion of the theological question of the time with the amplest freedom, was of incalculable value. Of this we have the testimony of the late C. P. Krauth, D.D., an eminent Lutheran divine of deep erudition. Dr. Krauth said of the Reformed Church: "There is no church in the land which has produced a larger number of well-trained theologians."

The educational abilities of the tutor pastors, Fries, Kunz, Helmuth, Lochman, Helffrich, the Helffensteins, Herman, the Beckers and others, are not to be disparaged. They were solid "pivot" men, as Dr. Weiser calls them, and wrought well. It was the establishment of the seminary, however, that brought to the front Mayer and Rauch and the rear guard of the reformed host, Nevin, Wolff, Harbaugh, Higbee, all now gone to await the final issues of life as they shall gather around them in the resurrection of the just.

In July, 1835, the first weekly number of "The Messenger" made its appearance. This paper, under the editorial supervision of Dr. B. S. Schneck and Dr. Samuel R. Fisher, became a powerful factor in promoting the interests of the Church, in consolidating its membership and in defending its distinctive doctrines. Now the newspapers and periodicals issued under the auspices of the Reformed Church and its colleges number twenty-four. The earliest German Reformed Sabbath-school was organized in Philadelphia in 1806, with forty scholars; now the Sabbath-schools of the Reformed Church number fifteen hundred and thirty-six, and their scholars over one hundred and forty thousand.

In 1846 the discussion of the doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper began to assume prominence in the theological world through the publication, by Dr. Nevin, of "The Mystical Presence a vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist;" a book remarkable as well for its profound ability, as for the theological conflict it evoked and attention drawn to the true eucharistic faith. The vigor and ability shown by the ministry of the Reformed Church, thus called into line of battle, was something wonderful, and the test was healthful to the Church. We have the testimony of Rev. Thomas G. Apple, D.D.,* "that the teaching in the seminary proved faithful to the original doctrine of the Church on the subject, and that there is in the Reformed Church of

* "Mercersburg Review," 1876, p. 72.

the United States scarcely a single minister who does not hold the view of Calvin and the Reformed Confessions."

In 1847 the effort to improve and elevate public worship, known as the Liturgical movement, came formally before the Eastern Synod, by a request from the Classis of Eastern Pennsylvania. At a Synod held in Norristown in 1849, Dr. Bomberger "made an elaborate report in which the general posture of the early Church and the Church of the Reformation was set forth, accompanied with resolutions in favor of an immediate onward movement for the formation of a Liturgy suitable to the wants of the churches represented by Synod." *

At the General Synod held at Dayton, Ohio, in 1866, where Dr. Nevin made an argument which went from heart to heart in the church, and was never forgotten by his auditors, the final success of the movement became assured. In 1884, the General Synod which met at Baltimore submitted the Directory of Worship to the Classes for adoption or rejection and in 1887, one year after Dr. Nevin's death, it became formally the authorized liturgy of the Reformed Church in the United States. Time fails me in presenting this movement in its appropriate historical character. I can only add that a discussion which once threatened to end the unity of the Reformed church, a controversy carried on for a period of forty years, has died away leaving the church in a higher state of religious life with a three-fold increase in the number of its ministers.†

Glancing for a moment at the history of the Western church, on the first of May, 1820, the classis of Ohio was organized with five ministers, fifty congregations and about eighteen hundred communicants. In 1824 it developed into a Synod. Now there are five powerful synods west of the Allegheny mountains, thirty classes, over seventy-one thousand communicants; a theological seminary, universities and colleges, whose basis of instruction is the inviolable divine authority of the Holy Scriptures and the doctrine contained in the Heidelberg Catechism.

* Appel's "Nevin," p. 482.

† Dubbs' Manual, page 361.

The Reformed Church is now equipped with Boards of Foreign and Domestic Missions, of Beneficiary Education and a society for the relief of ministers. Its pioneer ministers have long since crossed the swollen waters of the Illinois, following the trail of the emigrant to where his

"Axe rings sharply 'mid the forest shades
Which from Creation, toward the skies have towered in unshorn beauty ;"

and the Synod of Potomac has on its rolls the Classis of Portland-Oregon, and of San Francisco. When we add that the statistics of the Reformed Church in the United States, show that the number of its communicants has doubled in the last twenty years, where is there room for doubt that God has ordered all things for the best?

With her glorious history, her broad and comprehensive standards of faith, her simple and devout form of worship, her compact sacramental host moving on to future victories for the Kingdom of Christ, in the lingering twilight of the century, we joyfully go round about her Zion, "tell the towers thereof, mark well her bulwarks and consider her palaces that we may tell it to the generation following."

In the presence of the assembled *alumni* of the two colleges over which he presided, this retrospect of years now gone would be altogether deficient without some allusion to that massive character, the profound theologian, the kindly man, Dr. John W. Nevin. With a clear cut intellect and a will positive in its decisive decisions he was one of those colossal figures which stamp with the impress of their greatness the century in which they live. How well we recall his untiring and irrepressible energy and fortitude! How full of seed thoughts were all his discourses! How he thundered out to us, "no tradition, no mere conclusion of reason contrary to the clear testimony of the Holy Scriptures can be received as rules of faith or of life." Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man: "The fear of the Lord that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding."

Though his spirit has taken its flight into the imperishable glories of the new Jerusalem, he seems still to speak to us. After the lapse of forty-three years, I can still recall the wistful tenderness with which the kindly man regarded his students. With a soul growing in strength as the time appointed for an exchange of worlds drew near, with an unfaltering trust in the eternal promises of God, he entered into immortal life where no clouds obscure the thought or hinder the spirit's growth. The crown of righteousness is laid up for all who follow the conquering Christ.

It is proper also on this occasion to bear public testimony to the great loss the Board of Trustees has sustained in the death of Dr. J. P. Wickersham. I knew him well; he never faltered in the paths of duty. When the civil war came on, he bravely entered the field of conflict. The sympathies and labors of his life, however, were in the interests of education. He occupied a conspicuous place in the State where his scholarly attainments and the energy he threw into his work made him well known throughout the commonwealth. He had a ready command of his learning and was admirably adapted to what became the employment of his life. His name stands now enrolled in the history of the common schools of Pennsylvania with the names of Gov. George Wolf, Thaddeus Stevens and Thomas H. Burrows. In 1875, Dr. Wickersham was appointed the first Superintendent of Public Instruction, and such was his judicious management that a system of public instruction was introduced which commands unbounded respect and is worthy of the deep and broad foundation laid for education in the constitution of 1790.

Death has also within the past year entered the ranks of the *alumni*.

"We have heard the sound of their falling feet
Going down the river, where two worlds meet,
They go to return no more."

Dr. John H. A. Bomberger has taken his departure into the unseen world. Single and alone, having no classmates, he

started the roll of the alumni of Marshall College in 1837. In 1846, the year I entered college, he was the alumni orator, and the closing words of his address, "Remember that we are not only alumni, but alumni of Marshall College; and may the recollection of this piously cherished by every member of our brotherhood give energy to our future zeal in the pathway of learning," still linger in recollection like the dying cadence of some far distant music.

Of the death of Hon. A. K. Syester, Associate Justice of the 4th Judicial District of Maryland, we read not long since with full hearts. How well we recall his bright and intelligent face and kindly countenance that always bespoke the warm and generous heart. He gave promise while at college of high attainment in oratory. We all admired the beauty, elegance and melody of his diction, and he frequently represented the Diognothian Society at her anniversaries. Not a close or diligent student in *curriculum*, he devoted much time to wide and profitable reading that told powerfully in after professional life. He was an illustrious example of "poor boys who became famous." The son of a poor widow he rose to be Attorney General of the State of Maryland, stood in the front rank of the orators of that State and was in his day the ablest criminal lawyer, and the most eloquent forensic debater of his native commonwealth. His character as a Judge, I quote from the editorial column of the *Hagerstown News*. "He was just, he was merciful and at the Grand Assize where he has gone to meet the hosts that have preceded him, his cheek will not blanch when the Supreme Judge of all the earth shall lay down the rule, 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again;' because if ever a human being tempered judgment with mercy that being was Andrew K. Syester, and if ever a human heart went out in pity and help to the poor and oppressed that heart was his."

My recollections of A. K. Syester are associated with Rev. E. W. Reineke, D.D., and Walter J. Budd, Esq., who have so soon followed him to his grave. Dr. Reineke was a tutor of the

college in 1846-1848. He was a prudent, thoughtful, careful man; true to every obligation as a tutor and minister of the Gospel, he wrought with fidelity in his calling oblivious to popularity. His downcast eyes are now lighted up with immortality. Walter J. Budd graduated in 1846 and has been a prominent member of the Bar of Philadelphia for nearly forty years.

In closing I must make mention of the Professors in my college days who still survive. William M. Nevin, Emeritus alumni, Professor of Franklin and Marshall college and Traill Green, L.L.D., of Easton, Pennsylvania, still linger in life's journey loved and honored by their pupils now scattered far and wide over this republic. Life with them has not been a failure; their intercourse with young men was always pleasant and delightful, and they both testify that life with them has been worth living. We send them kindly greeting from this alumni assembly.

They have seen class after class come in and go out; generation follow generation like shadows across the plain. Were this all followed by the eternal oblivion of the grave, we might well say with "the preacher, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity." But the days of heathenism and agnosticism are over with us, and we no longer lay our dead in cold despair beneath the cypress shade to sleep the sleep that knows no morning. Religion girdles the coffin and the grave with glory.

The time draws on when not a single spot of burial earth, whether on land or in the spacious sea but must give up its long committed dust inviolate.

Yes, when the archangel's trump shall sound Bomberger, Little, Mayberry, Funk, Kremer, Butler, Albert, Beck, Clark, Newcomer and the long roll of our alumni over whom death has rocked a little below in the quiet church yard, will burst the bonds of death and rise victorious from the grave. Reynolds will come from his tomb among the cypress of Louisiana; Perry A. Rice will come from his unknown grave among our country's martyrs on Belle Island; Grafius will come from his sea weed

shroud and his coral coffin far down in the deep green waters of the Atlantic; and the murdered missionary David Elliott Campbell will leap exultant from his grave at Cawnpore, India, with the immortal light of God upon his countenance.

Let us all so live that with Rauch, Samuel W. Budd, Nevin and the good of all ages we may "Stand on the sea of glass having harps of gold" and together "Sing the song of Moses, the servant of God and the song of the Lamb."

IV.

THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT IN THE SCOTTISH CHURCH.

BY REV. WILLIAM FREDERICK FABER.

THE appearance of the sixth edition of *A Book of Common Order** is, at least to the student of Liturgics, an important event. Those who are interested in the elevation of public worship have received, in this new publication, not only a volume very rich and valuable in itself, but a new impulse to go forward in the right direction. The issue of this revised Service-book of Scottish Presbyterians serves again to remind us most forcibly of the wonderful advance within a generation, as regards not only sound views of worship, but a right sentiment in respect to the deeper matters of Catholicity and Christian Unity. It serves also to show that the Established Church of Scotland is not behind the times. Take it all in all, there is at the present day no member of the great Presbyterian family in the world more abreast with the times, more alive to the questions and issues which are beginning to confront us all, than the old Kirk. One of these days the Presbyterians in this country will better appreciate her new life and thought. A few more years of "Revision" and "Inaugural" education will wonderfully open our eyes to see what British thinkers on both sides of the Tweed, High Church and Broad Church, have really been about.

It is an interesting story, that of the new movement in the

* *Εὐχολογίον*. A Book of Common Order: Being Forms of Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Ordinances of the Church; Issued by the Church Service Society. Sixth Edition. Carefully Revised. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1890.

Established Church of Scotland. In her *Memoir of Principal Tulloch* Mrs. Oliphant devotes an entire chapter to this "Renaissance," as she terms it. We in America are wont, of course, to side with those who in 1843 left the Establishment and organized the so-called Free Church; and, doubtless, the wrongs which they demanded should be abolished, and from which their only deliverance, as they thought, lay in secession, were wrongs which must be abolished, wrongs not to be endured or acquiesced in. There are two sides, however, to most questions; and we may be permitted to say that the event proves that not all the truth,—nor, for that matter, all the freedom, either,—was with the Free Church.

It was indeed a terrible depletion that the Established Church suffered in the great exodus, headed by Chalmers; yet there were many very noble and godly ministers left who in all conscience could not feel it their duty to do otherwise than stand by the "Church of their fathers." It was at the moment not the popular side. It was hard to raise much enthusiasm; those who would not go out were charged with cowardice and mercenary motives, and there was laid upon their shoulders an added responsibility—the task not only of ministering in their parishes, but of vindicating the right of the Established Church to continue to exist. Such an experience would serve, if anything could, to throw the clergy out of old ruts. And so it did, in fact. The ordeal was a blessing in disguise. There came forth theological leaders who could not have had liberty to pursue their course in the Free Church, nor in the Old Church previous to the disruption. They would not have been tolerated. They did startle their brethren, it is true, when they first gave expression to their new views; they raised no small commotion; but eventually they were headed; and now they are followed. To the praise of the Established Church be it said—they lived and died in her communion. I mean notably Norman Macleod, John Tulloch, and Robert Lee.

It would be pleasant, if this were the place for it, to recall those excited days in '64 and '65, when Norman Macleod had

given utterance to his views on the Sabbath, Principal Tulloch to his on the Westminster Confession, and when Dr. Robert Lee had begun his terrible innovations of written prayers, chants, and a harmonium. There fell into our hands a short time since an interesting letter, written in January, 1866, to the *New York Evangelist* by its London correspondent. It pictured the state of feeling in Britain over those three dreadful men and their works, exhibiting on the part of the writer himself no small amount of alarm as to what these things might come to; and went on to describe several cartoons caricaturing the principal actors in the new movement. One in particular is too good for us to omit, the more so since it has a present relevancy to our subject.

"The caricaturist I mentioned before, has a clever hit at the trio in picture called 'The Navvies.' Dr. Robert Lee is displayed, surrounded with all manner of popish paraphernalia, and is hounding on his two underlings, Principal Tulloch, who is busy at the foundation of the Confession of Faith, while Dr. Macleod is digging a deep hole for the two [*sic*] commandments. The Doctor is saying, 'Settle for the Confession, Tulloch, and I'll soon put the commandments out of sight. Dr. Lee encourages with 'Work away, my lads, with a will, we'll soon make an end of the whole thing.'"

Very amusing, certainly. But let us listen to a more fair minded witness, who is able to give us a better account of what really was happening in the Church of Scotland. Mrs. Oliphant, in the chapter of Tulloch's *Memoir* already referred to, says:

"For the first time a longing for freer air and an expanded atmosphere came with the quick growth of renewed existence. It awoke in the open, liberal and dispassionate mind of Principal Tulloch, in one department of thought and life; in the large, fervent, sympathetic nature of Norman Macleod in another; and in the precise and keen intellect of Robert Lee in a third. All of them were roused by one impulse—seized by a longing after a communion more extended than that which was confined within the limits of a scientific system of doctrine and

a certain number of centuries. They bethought themselves simultaneously that the Apostles' Creed was older and wider and simpler than the Westminster Confession; that the laws of God had been revealed before ever the Reformers were thought of, and that prayer and praise had not been invented in the sixteenth century. . . . Their minds had taken a new turn, unprecedented in Scottish ways. A longing for something 'more Catholic, more magnanimous,' as Irving had said in a previous generation, came upon them."

"Work away, my lads, with a will, we'll soon make an end of the whole thing"—was the caricaturists' interpretation of the movement. But it was far from the minds of these gifted and godly men to "make an end of the whole thing," or indeed to make an end of anything except the traditionalism and inherited provincialism which held Scotland in bondage. They were, rather, bent on making a beginning; yet not as if that implied their bringing in a new thing, rather, it was a bringing back of the old and larger thing; in a word, if you will, Catholicity. Norman Macleod was for the moment out-voted in the Kirk, in Scotland,—it might even be, in Britain; but he well knew, as we all to-day pretty generally know, that in the Reformation Church (to go no further) he would have been with Luther and Calvin. Principal Tulloch seemed, as our American revisionists to-day seem to some, to be bent on destruction only, to be intent on doing away with creeds and symbols; in reality the outcome of his efforts was to disengage the Faith once delivered, and to restore the Creed which is supreme over all confessions and which is never to be revised. And Dr. Robert Lee seemed to be effacing the historic identity of the Presbyterian cultus, by bringing in new ways of worship, or, worse still, bringing back the old ways of the "Scarlet Woman;" in truth, he, too, stood in the main on good Presbyterian ground, and had good Presbyterian precedent for at least some of his practices; while he was reaching out still further, and laying claim to the treasures of the whole Christian Church, and appropriating them to the use of his own people.

It is scarcely necessary to speak of the fact that the worship in which the Apostles and the first Christians engaged, and the worship of the first centuries of the Christian Church, as it grew and was enriched with legitimate enrichment, was not in any sense that barren, extemporaneous, and largely homiletical exercise which in some parts of Protestantism it had become, and which Dr. Lee found universally prevalent in Scotland. To set him right, and those Presbyterians who are with him in this matter, it is more to the point to recall the fact that the worship of the first Presbyterians in Scotland was, like the worship of all the early Protestants, liturgical; that John Knox was in this also, the disciple of John Calvin; that John Calvin had prepared certainly two liturgies, one for the church at Strasburg, another for his own church at Geneva, and that after this latter John Knox patterned his *Book of Common Order*, which was ratified by successive General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland.

But how came Scotland to lose her *Book of Common Order*, and after a time to forget that she had ever had it? That would be a long story to narrate; it will suffice us for our present purpose to recall the tyranny of Laud and his ill-timed attempts to impose Episcopacy on Scotland, the monumental folly of thinking to force the Prayer Book (and in a most objectionable edition) upon an unwilling people, provoking thereby the memorable tumult in St. Giles', Edinburgh; and how, not long after this there came the great Revolution; with it the Westminster Assembly. The Presbyterians of Scotland were willing to co-operate with their Puritan brethren in England, though in not a few things they differed with them, certainly with the Independents. The Westminster Assembly formulated new standards of doctrine, discipline and worship, which the Scottish brethren were ready to accept, with the understanding that their own should not thereby be abrogated. Yet what more natural than that, just as the Confession of Westminster came to be the doctrinal standard, so also the Westminster Directory should take the place of the old Common Order as the rule of

worship? And with the perfidious Charles II after the Restoration to refresh their recollections of Laud and of Charles I before the Revolution, gradually and naturally associating with Liturgy Prelacy, and with Prelacy Tyranny—what wonder that in the popular mind the characteristic exponent of Scottish views on Liturgy should be the famous Jenny Geddes and her stool? Yet it is a singular thing to note by the way, that Scottish Episcopalians for a considerable period used prayer book and surplice as little as did their Presbyterian brethren, officiating in black robes like the Calvinistic clergy, and using free prayers.

We have spoken of Dr. Robert Lee as if he had been the very first in the Church of Scotland in this latter day to revive liturgical worship. That is not exactly true. There had been two other eminent divines in that church, Dr. Robertson, of Glasgow Cathedral, and Dr. Crawford, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh, who had made a beginning in that direction; but for some reason did not accomplish much. Dr. Lee, however, in his Church of Greyfriars, Edinburgh, had introduced written prayers and other liturgical forms, and though arraigned for these practices in his Presbytery in 1859, he maintained his position, advanced still further, and drew some disciples about him. In short, he made a place for this movement and with great keenness and power maintained its right to go on. But he died in 1868, not having seen as yet much change in the Church at large.

At this point we may as well pause a moment to note the characteristics which marked Dr. Lee's productions and compilations in the liturgical field. It is but just to say that the present writer has never seen the Greyfriars' Prayer-Books, and that his statements are based upon the representations of trustworthy and friendly witnesses. Keenness of intellect (as already intimated) more than fervor of devotion, was the peculiar gift of this remarkable man. It seems also that he lacked poetic feeling, the sense of rhythm, the correct liturgical taste, without which it is impossible to compose prayers and

other forms that shall be otherwise than dry, unsatisfactory and ephemeral. "Reading out of a newspaper" was suggested to the genial "Country Parson" who listened once upon a time to Greyfriars' prayers; and he is himself of the liturgical wing. In reading of Dr. Lee and his work we cannot escape the rising suspicion that he had reached liturgical views by processes of study and then set himself to putting them in practice by processes not less purely intellectual; that moreover, being opposed, he performed his liturgy not only to worship Almighty God, but to shock and to defy his opponents. We say, we have a feeling that way. Probably the good Doctor was not himself conscious of such an animus. But he was unmistakably a polemic, fitted for controversy, delighting to bring his adversaries to confusion of face.

But let that pass. The movement itself, ably served by Dr. Lee, was passing beyond him, as needs it must. It took organized form when on January 31, 1865, the "Church Service Society" was formed. Dr. Lee joined it; but, probably expecting that his own prayer-book would be adopted by the Society to be propagated throughout the Kirk, and certainly disappointed in that expectation if he had entertained it, he seems to have rather lost interest in it.

The Society set itself a task more needful there and anywhere when improvement of worship is contemplated. It set itself, not to making new orders of service, but rather to the study of the services of the past, and especially of the primitive liturgies. Out of such study came in 1867 the first *Book of Common Order*, a sort of manual for the help of ministers, affording them materials for selection and combination, but prescribing no entire service. The second edition followed in 1869, still only a treasury of liturgical forms, with no complete order. The third book took a step in advance, in providing a complete service, together with liturgical selections. The fourth, fifth and sixth have come; the fifth and sixth lie before us at this writing, substantial 12mo. volumes of some four hundred pages each, containing lectionaries for regular Sundays, daily and fes-

tival Scripture lessons through the year, providing complete services for every Sunday morning and evening of the possible five Sundays in a month, complete orders for the Holy Communion, for Baptism, for the Burial of the Dead, etc.; and to us more valuable still, a very rich collection of Sentences, Versicles, Collects, Prayers for various occasions.

Let us now look at the new *Book of Common Order* a little more in detail. The ordinary morning service runs as follows:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. A Psalm or Hymn. | 7. Second Lesson—New Testament. |
| 2. Sentences. | 8. The <i>Benedictus</i> or other Hymn or Psalm. |
| 3. Invocation; Confession; Prayer for Pardon and Peace; Supplications; the Lord's Prayer, the Congregation joining. | 9. The Apostles' Creed. |
| 4. The Psalter, said or sung, prefaced with Responsive Versicles, and closed with Gloria Patri. | 10. Salutation; Intercessions; Thanksgivings, prefaced with brief Versicles. |
| 5. The First Scripture Lesson, from the Old Testament; after each Lesson a Sentence of Praise. | 11. Psalm or Hymn. |
| 6. The <i>Te Deum</i> or other Hymn or Psalm. | 12. Brief Prayer for Illumination. |
| | 13. Sermon, closing with an Ascription of Praise. |
| | 14. The Offering. |
| | 15. Psalm or Hymn. |
| | 16. Benediction. |

As we compare this Order with that of the fifth edition, we note slight but significant changes. The parts of this service, and their arrangement, show an ever closer approximation to the Common Prayer Book type. The fifth edition showed similarity; the sixth, almost identity, certainly structural identity.

Whether this gradual approximation is due to the excellence of the Prayer Book structure, which grows more and more on those who study it; or whether it evidences a willingness to adopt whatever may without sacrifice of principle be adopted over from Anglicanism, for the sake of greater harmony and agreement in non-essentials; we are unable to pronounce. Something might be said for either view. Certainly it is a significant fact, interpret it as we may.

The Communion Service shows the results of wide liturgical study. We find here what one naturally looks for in a complete form for the Eucharist. The Nicene Creed (or Apostles', in the fifth edition as alternative), Prayer of Access, Sursum Corda, Ter Sanctus, Agnus Dei, Church Militant Prayer. One might have preferences for a different arrangement of parts; but in this service there is certainly nothing mean, trivial, or bald. It is solemn, catholic, sacramental, evangelical.

The *Book of Common Order* is not laid out for the Church Year, but it makes room for the keeping of sacred seasons and festival days, by providing, in the general collections of forms, collects and other forms suitable for the chief of them. Nor is the book one for the congregation, properly speaking; it is a minister's book still, as were the first editions, and by the minister to be used as in his judgment he sees fit.

Much more should we be glad to say of this important publication, and still more important movement of which it is an exponent. We cannot do less than commend it most warmly to the attention of our readers as a volume which will repay study, and which one should have always near at hand. The Common Prayer itself is, in our estimation, inferior to it in one respect: the Treasury of Collects and Prayers seems to us far to surpass the Anglican. We cannot close without referring the reader also to a most attractive and valuable article on the subject in the November, 1890, number of *Blackwood's Magazine*, written by A. K. H. B., the famous "Country Parson," who has been many years a member of the Church Service Society, and hence knows its history from the inside.

V.

DIVINE REVELATION,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MESSIANIC PROPHECY
AND ITS FULFILLMENT.

BY REV. SAMUEL Z. BEAM, D.D.

It is here assumed that God can reveal Himself to His intelligent creatures, and that man can know Him only as He reveals Himself. This two-fold assumption is based on the thought, (1) that the Creator of intelligent beings must Himself be intelligent, and that He who can create beings with reasoning powers, can also communicate with and make Himself known to them; (2) that universal experience has taught men that, with all their unaided efforts, they cannot "by searching find out the Almighty to perfection." We can only know Him, therefore, as He reveals Himself to us.

Divine Revelation is two-fold:

1. It is *objective* in the form of creation, including the whole material universe, with man at its head. In this form of revelation God makes known His attributes of power, wisdom and goodness.

2. It is *subjective* in the mind and conscience of men. In this form of revelation God declares Himself by the moral law, written on the hearts of men, whereby He shows them their freedom and responsibility. This law enforces its authority through the medium of the conscience, which, for this reason, may be called the voice of God in men.

If sin had not entered into the world and destroyed man's power of obeying this law, it is probable that no further revelation would have been necessary. But sin is in the world,

and in consequence revelation has taken a third form, which may be defined as both *objective and subjective*. In its written form it is objective, addressing men from without. But it was first communicated to men, inspired for the purpose, by whom it was then made known to others in a written record. In this last form it became special, having in view Christ and His redemption *objectively*, and the salvation of men *subjectively*.

The contents of the Bible were written at different times, by different persons, during a period of about fifteen hundred years. The writers represent many different ranks and conditions of life, as lawgivers, judges, prophets, kings, herdsmen, farmers and religious teachers. They all claim to have written what was made known to them by divine inspiration; so that with all, or most of them, the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," or its equivalent, is a common expression.

Their writings pertain to all the interests of men, temporal and spiritual; and their ostensible purpose is to show men their relations to God and His relations to them, together with His purposes with reference to their present welfare and future destiny. The writers of the Old Testament, while recording the revelations made to them, are constantly directing the attention of their readers to a revelation at some future time, which is to transcend and supersede theirs, because it is to be embodied in a person. So at least it appears when we read from the standpoint of our New Testament knowledge, although Old Testament prophets and saints may have been but dimly conscious of the sublime truth contained in their sacred Scriptures.

At the beginning we have a succinct and clear account of the history of creation, including a two-fold account of the origin of man. Then follows an account of the unhappy fall and expulsion from the garden of Eden, the terrors of which are, however, softened by the hope of future victory over sin, inspired in the hearts of our first parents, by the proto-evangel. Afterwards appears the evil fruit of the apostasy in the murder of Abel, and the almost universal prevalence of rebel-

lion and sin when only Noah and his family remained true to their God. This universal apostasy brought on the flood, which destroyed that wicked generation, saving only Noah and his family, in whom we have the beginning of a new race. Then, in the course of time, a new defection followed, and men attempted to mount up to heaven by building their God-defying tower, in consequence of which they suffered the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of the race, which it seems to have been their purpose to prevent. Further on comes the call of Abraham, to whom the promise was made, that in "His seed all the families of the earth should be blessed," which was also repeated to Isaac and Jacob and their children through all their generations.

After the entrance of Jacob and his family into Egypt, the history narrows down to the children of Israel and their relations with the neighboring peoples. In connection with their history, in all its vicissitudes, God, or Jehovah, appears as a prominent figure, giving them success or defeat, reward or punishment, according to their obedience or disobedience, and directing their development in such way as, in His wisdom, was best for accomplishing His purposes.

Through Moses, Jehovah (Elohim) reveals Himself as Law-giver and King, and under His theocratic government, requires the most implicit obedience to all His commands. Under this double government the whole course of the history of Israel constitutes a system of disciplinary training, which appears arbitrary and often burdensome, but which, in the childhood of the race, seems to have been necessary to secure their proper development, and especially to insure a line of descent among the chosen people, worthy to reach their exalted destiny in the Virgin Mary, who was to be the mother of the promised Messiah.

Along with this recorded history, and sometimes mingled with it, are found patriotic songs, sacred lyrics, poetical prayers and praises to Jehovah, in many of which predictions are made concerning future events in the history of that people, closely

connected with which prophecies, both typical and direct, appear to inspire and encourage the hope of a coming Deliverer.

In the prophetic books, this Deliverer is specifically described under the name of Messiah, as the Son and successor of David.

Messianic prophecy was germinally contained in the promise (Gen. 3:15) usually called the proto-evangel. But it only began to assume a definite form after the calling of Abraham.

Up to this time, B. C. 1921, according to the common chronology, the prophecy is of a general character. After this it became particular, and slowly but gradually took a specific form, "narrowing down in ever diminishing circles," until it clearly designated and described a unique person, with a specific character.

The course of this development in Messianic prophecy coincides with the growth and development of the chosen people, descended from Abraham. And it is remarkable that many of the most precious promises to this people are made in connection with the announcement of the severest judgments. This is doubtless designed to remind them, that while God must and will chastise the sins of His children, and can by no means clear the guilty, yet He remembers them in mercy.

We can not, of course, follow the history of this race through all its vicissitudes; that would carry us beyond the limits of a Review article.

But for the sake of convenience we may divide their history into three parts, and name them *the primitive, the medieval and the modern ages*. Let the *primitive age* extend from the call of Abraham to the death of "the elders that overlived Joshua," about B. C. 1400; the *medieval age*, from that time to the return of the captivity, about B. C. 586; the *modern age*, from the return of the captivity till the dissolution of the Jewish nation, about A. D. 70, at which time the Christian Church was already fully established, and prosperously working under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit.

During the first period Jehovah was worshiped by the whole people, and they remained substantially true to Him in the

main, although we can trace a tendency towards idolatry throughout the entire period. Yet the idolatry, except in sporadic cases, consisted rather in representing Jehovah by images and worshiping Him in them, than in falling away to the false gods of the Gentiles.

During this time the prophecies concerning the Messiah embrace the general idea of a race deliverance or national redemption. They were all the Lord's people, and as such could claim a right or share in the coming redemption.

In the *second or middle period* the people became gradually more and more entangled in heathenish idolatry. Many of them repudiated the true God, who had brought them up out of Egypt; and they degenerated into the debasing and corrupting worship of the Canaanites, in consequence of which they suffered the severe judgments of God, chief among which was the withdrawal of the Messianic promise from the people as a whole, together with the narrowing down of the prophecy to the tribe of Judah and the family of David.

After the division of the kingdom, the worship of Jehovah became almost obsolete among the ten revolted tribes, in consequence of which, after many judgments, all Israel was carried into captivity about B. C. 730. From that time the kingdom and people of Israel became lost to history, and were deprived of the Messianic hope. Subsequently to that sad event, the worship of Jehovah was confined to the kingdom of Judah. But alas! even Judah fell into gross idolatry, and was carried to Babylon where it remained for seventy years. The salutary effect of this captivity, however, was to cure the people of Judah entirely of their idolatry.

At the end of the seventy years the captivity was restored, the ancient faith was renewed by a remnant of the people, who anxiously waited for the fulfilment of the prophecies, and the temple worship was again observed as of old.

In the *third period*, which commenced with the return of the captivity and the restoration of the temple worship, idolatry was entirely abolished. But Pharisaism developed a traditional

legalism and Sadduceeism, a semi-scepticism, neither of which was much better than idolatry itself. The mass of the people preserved, indeed, the forms of true worship, but after all, their hearts were far from God, their service being only outward and formal and not inward and spiritual.

During the early years of this period the Messianic prophecies, which had already taken a definite and specific form in the preceding period, pointing unmistakably to a person in whom the Messianic idea was to be perfected and realized, began to be more thoroughly emphasized. With Malachi, B. C. 400, Messianic prophecy reached its completion and therefore ceased, with the promise of the sudden coming of the Lord to His temple, and of the rising of the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His wings.

While we follow with sadness the defection of the chosen people, together with the withdrawal of the promise, and the narrowing down to a single family, and at last to a single individual; we happily discern on the other hand a widening of the promise, till we find it embracing the whole world, Jews and Gentiles alike, in the great redemption.

Accordingly we rejoice in the revelation of the fact that Jehovah is not a mere national god, like the deities of the Gentiles; but the only living and true God; and that His redemption is not confined to a single people or to a limited number of elect individuals, while the rest of the human race are to be left helplessly in their sins, without the hope of salvation; but that it embraces mankind universally.

We now turn to the consideration of a few of the prophecies, which are generally believed to be Messianic.

In Gen. iii. 15, God said to the serpent, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." This is regarded as the first in the long line of Messianic prophecies. It is very general, meaning probably, that in the struggle with evil in all its forms, including the activity of Satan, the human race, or the descendants of the woman, shall

eventually gain a complete victory, though not without injury to themselves. This promise forms the fundamental principle, or rock foundation, for all subsequent Messianic prophecies; and, when rightly interpreted, it certainly appears to furnish a basis broad enough for all future revelation.

The final victory for mankind, which it so richly promises, is to be fulfilled through the mediation of a chosen seed, to be derived from Abraham, whom God afterwards separated and sanctified for His special purpose. Abraham occupies an isolated position after the divine vocation, but he still personally represents the primitive race, of which he is the highest and best development, and at the same time he is the head of a chosen race, through which the promised salvation is to come.

Accordingly, the promise is first made to Abraham personally: "In *thee* shall all families of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xii. 13.) Afterwards the promise is modified so as to include his posterity: "In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in *thy seed* shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: because thou hast obeyed my voice." (Gen. xxii. 17, 18.)

Thus the first promise, announcing victory for the seed of the woman, or for mankind universally, is here made to the seed of Abraham, through whom it is now made evident, the victory and triumph of the human race are to come.

The seed of Abraham includes the whole nation descended from him. But the phrase, "shall possess the gate of his enemies," seems to imply that this seed is to be gathered up in a single person, as the singular pronoun "his" indicates.

The repetition of the same promise to Isaac, narrows the prophecy down to his branch of the Abrahamic family, while yet the world is to enjoy the benefit of the promised victory and triumph. (Gen. xxvi. 4.) Again, the prophetic blessing, pronounced by Isaac upon Jacob and his family, is a further narrowing of the circle, by which the conquering of the serpent

brood is confined to the house of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 4) ; which blessing upon Jacob was confirmed by the Lord Himself, when He appeared at the top of the ladder, and renewed the promise which had been made to Abraham and Isaac, that "in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xxviii. 14.)

So far, the prophecy, though considerably narrowed down, is still general, and can not, except in the light of subsequent prophecies, be interpreted to mean a single person, because it immediately follows the declaration, "Thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth," &c. (Gen. xxviii. 14.) It is the seed of Jacob which is to spread abroad to the east and to the west, &c., (v. 14.) But Jacob, when pronouncing his parting benediction upon his children, singles out from the rest the tribe of Judah, and puts the scepter in his hand, declaring that "the scepter shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet until Shiloh come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be." (Gen. xlix. 10.)

Here, evidently, is an advance in the unfolding of Messianic revelation; and yet interpreters find it difficult to decide whether Shiloh means Judah returned victorious from war and settled down to a peaceful rest, or whether it points to the place where the ark rested (Shiloh), or whether finally, it points directly to a person who is to be known as Shiloh, because He is to give rest to His people. If it does not refer directly to the coming of Christ, it may be called a typical prophecy, in which Shiloh, the *rest giver*, is set forth as a type of Christ, who is ultimately to bring peace on earth and tranquillity to mankind. The ancient Jews, we are informed, interpreted the word Shiloh to mean the Messiah.

As the closing prophecy of Genesis, it shows a development from the original promise, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and also a decided advance beyond the promise made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.*

* We do not forget that some of the critics deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and assign a much later date for their composition than tradition

The next that specially attracts attention is the prophecy of Balaam. (Num. xxiv. 17-19.)

This is primarily a promise of success to all Israel in subduing their enemies. "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth," &c. The conquest is to be achieved by Israel, but under the leadership of some king; for "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion," &c. (Num. xxiv. 19). This prophecy may point to David (2 Sam. viii. 2), or to some other great king of Israel. But in any case he is a type of the Messiah, who, according to subsequent prophecies, is also to be a king, who "shall break the heathen with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." (Ps. ii. 9.)

There is no hazard, therefore, in claiming for this prophecy a Messianic character; and especially as the best interpreters, both Jewish and Christian, agree in assigning it a place among the prophecies concerning the Christ. Israel is to survive the fall of the nations, and is to exercise dominion, not partially and temporarily, as in the time of David and Solomon, but universally and forever. But this can only come to pass through the agency of a personal ruler, to whom shall be "given dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages shall serve him; and whose dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away." (Dan. vii. 14.)

The last Pentateuchal prophecy relating to the Messiah represents Him in the character of a prophet, (Deut. 18: 15-18). As a prophet, He is inspired to speak with divine authority. He is to be raised up from the midst of Israel a prophet like unto Moses; and the words of the Lord are to be put in His mouth. He is to speak all that Jehovah commands, and the

allows. But the only question that concerns the present purpose is, "were the prophecies written before the birth of Christ?" or before the time of their alleged fulfilment? If so, we are entitled to call them true prophecies. And we feel quite sure that no honest critic will assign them a date later than the time of the exile, which we believe, however, to be entirely too late.

people are directed to hearken to his words, under a penalty; "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him" (Deut. 18: 19). This is the last and most explicit prediction found in the writings of Moses, concerning the coming of Christ. It is true, some eminent biblical scholars think that this prediction cannot be limited, in its application, to a single individual, on the plausible supposition, that the passage refers primarily to the institution of the prophetic order. There can be no serious objection to "taking the word 'prophet' in a collective sense," if it is still maintained that the prophetic order reached its highest development, and perfect consummation in the person of the Messiah. It has been maintained with justice, that this prophecy rests on the fundamental principle, that the theocracy needs, not merely a ruler or king to conquer and govern the hostile nations, but also a prophet to declare authoritatively the counsel and will of Jehovah. And that it ultimately predicts the Messiah, was certainly supposed by St. Peter (Acts 3: 22-23), when he quoted the words of this prophecy and declared them to have been fulfilled in Christ. It was also quoted by St. Stephen for a similar purpose. (Acts 7: 37.)

After this prediction, which still presents the Messianic idea in its wider sense, as belonging to the entire people of Israel, we find the promise made to David, (2 Sam. ch. 7,) as the foundation of this idea, in a more definite and restricted sense; from which time on, the peculiar personal characteristics of the Messiah begin to receive attention at the hands of the prophets.

The prophet Nathan was commissioned with precious promises to David, chief among which is this—"Also the Lord telleth thee that He will make thee a house" (2 Sam. 7: 11). Then speaking more particularly of his son Solomon, whom Jehovah chose to build the temple which David had proposed to build, and promising to establish his throne for ever, the prophet declares the word of the Lord still further as follows:—"And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before

thee; thy throne shall be established for ever" (v. 16). This promise is repeated by the singer and poet, Ethan, where under divine inspiration he sang—"Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me, etc." (Ps. 89: 35-37). Indeed this whole Psalm is Messianic, and was written in time of deep distress, when David's throne was temporarily cast down to the ground (v. 44). It contemplates the contrast between the low estate of David's kingdom at that time, and the exalted position it was to take in the future, when it should "be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven" (v. 37). The promises recorded here can not refer to David personally, but to his future seed, who cannot be cast down, but who will rule forever, in righteousness. God's oath confirms this. The endurance of the throne is symbolized by the sun and moon, the human ideal of what is most exalted and enduring in nature. Accordingly the ultimate reference can be to no other than the Son and Lord of David, or the Messiah.

Subsequent to this, the prophetic utterances concerning the Messiah, are more frequent, and more definite, not only speaking of Him as a person, but also of His personal character: naming the very works He will do, declaring His manner of life and speech, and also predicting His sufferings and death, even the manner of His death, His being numbered with transgressors, and His burial with the rich. Indeed so many and so circumstantial are these predictions, that neither our time nor space will permit us to quote them.

There are also references to the time and place of His advent, the kind of reception He shall meet among His own people, and to the call and salvation of the Gentiles. In fact a complete description of Him, in all His relations with men, might easily be gathered from the prophecies, such as would answer perfectly to the character of Jesus Christ, as we now have it described in the Gospels.

The time at which He was to appear was definitely pointed out, and a number of concurrent circumstances led the people,

in different localities widely separated, to expect the advent of the Messiah, about the time when Jesus was born in Bethlehem. One of these circumstances was already alluded to by Jacob, in his parting benediction. 'The scepter shall not depart from Judah, etc," which meant that Shiloh should come before Judah, the ruling tribe should lose its supremacy and be without a king. Herod the Great, in the time of whose reign Jesus was born, was the last actual king that sat upon the throne of Judah. Although a few so-called kings were appointed by Cæsar, to succeed Herod, their jurisdictions were greatly restricted, and the laws of the Roman Empire governed the Jews, instead of their own laws and customs, so that this prophecy reached its fulfilment in the birth of Jesus. At any rate it is certain that since the time of Christ, Judah's supremacy has entirely departed, and their dispersion, for eighteen hundred years, ought to convince them that their long expected Shiloh must have come at the appointed time.

Another concurrent circumstance is predicted by Malachi, the last of the prophets: "I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in, behold He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. 3: 1; conf. Isa. 40: 3). This is the last recorded of the Messianic prophecies. It has always been regarded by Jews and Christians as referring to the advent of Christ. It makes Him appear in the temple, and, of course, therefore, before its destruction. It accords fully with another prediction by the prophet Haggai, who prophesied to the returned captives. When they wept over the insignificance of the new temple, as compared with the magnificence and glory of Solomon's, the prophet comforted them with this promise: "And I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." . . . The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts: and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of hosts" (Hag. 2: 7, 9).

The explanation of this prophecy is furnished by that already quoted from Malachi, and the appearance of Jesus in the temple, manifesting His wisdom and power, answers the descriptions and fulfils the predictions of both the prophets.

But once more, in Daniel, a prophet of the Captivity, occurs a prediction which not only fixes the time when Messiah shall come, but also when He shall be cut off, and when the city and sanctuary shall be destroyed, indicating the means of their destruction, the abolition of the daily sacrifice and oblation, and declaring that the idols of the desolator shall be set up on the battlements, by which the holy place shall be desecrated by the abomination that shall make it desolate (Dan. 9: 25-27). This prophecy designates the number of years "from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah, the Prince" (v. 25). Seventy weeks of years, or four hundred and ninety years. This period, according to most computations, was completed about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, when the daily sacrifice and the oblation ceased. It is worthy of remark here, with reference to this prophecy, that a great deliverer was expected to come out of Judah about that time. Nor was the expectation limited to the Jews; it was shared by many of the Gentiles, a fact noted by two Roman historians, Tacitus and Suetonius.

Opinions differ as to what decree or command is meant in the prophecy of Daniel; but all agree that the prophecy was made long ages before the advent of Christ. We know that a man named Jesus appeared a while previous to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and that He claimed to be the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy. He predicted the speedy overthrow of the Jewish nation, and most of the calamities that would befall the Jews. He likewise predicted His own death and resurrection. He was slain by His own people, or by their instigation. When demanding His death they assumed for themselves whatever responsibility or penalty might result from the murder of Jesus, saying, "His blood be upon us, and our children." The complete fulfilment of these predictions, to-

gether with the curse that has followed that people until this day, furnishes an incontestable evidence and proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. No other person answers to the description, even in a small degree, though many have, at different times, pretended to be Messiahs. No other events in the world's history in the slightest degree correspond to these predictions.

If now we take these acknowledged historical facts, in connection with the entire destruction of Jerusalem, the demolition of the temple, the ceasing of the sacrifice and oblation, and the denationalization of the Jews, it is plain that any future fulfilment of the prophecies is rendered impossible. Hence we are shut up to the conclusion that Jesus is the Christ of prophecy, or reduced to the necessity of relegating both prophecy and Gospel to the domain of mythology.

Again, taking the angel or "Messenger" of Malachi (3: 11) to be John the Baptist, and remembering that he was immediately followed by Jesus of Nazareth, whom John declared to be the "Lamb of God, etc.," and that Jesus suddenly appeared in the temple, purifying it by casting out those who desecrated that holy shrine; that He spake there, as never man spake; that He manifested superhuman wisdom and power within its precincts, thereby giving it a glory far transcending that of the temple of Solomon; we are once more irresistibly driven to the conclusion that Jesus is the Christ of prophecy. And not only so, but, according to Malachi, He is Lord of the temple, and, therefore, speaks and acts with divine authority.

But furthermore, the place of His birth was explicitly stated—"But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth unto me he that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old from everlasting" (Mic. 5: 2). This was regarded by the Jews as a direct prophecy concerning the Messiah. Accordingly when Herod demanded of the chief priests and scribes, "Where Christ should be born," they replied without hesitation, "In Bethlehem of Judea, for thus it is written by the prophet. And thou Bethlehem" etc. (Matt. 2: 5, 6, conf.

John 7: 42.) Now we know, what nobody but Renan denies, that, although Joseph and Mary lived at Nazareth, Jesus was born in Bethlehem. (St. Luke 2: 1-7.) It was also declared that Messiah should be born of a virgin. "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son." (Isa. 7: 14.) This was fulfilled, according to St. Matthew, in the birth of Jesus, (Matt. 1: 18-25, conf. Luke 1: 26, 27), and as far as we have any records, no one at the time denied the fact; but His enemies made use of it, to defame the virgin and to cast discredit upon Jesus Himself. Indeed, even Joseph, her espoused husband, for a time was troubled with doubts and scruples concerning her fidelity. But being assured by an angel, that she was pure, and that her conception was of the Holy Ghost, and therefore miraculous, he gave up his scruples and took her to his own home. It is the supernatural character of the transaction, however, that is offensive to the natural reason, and it is by no means wonderful, that men accustomed to looking only on the natural side of every thing, are skeptical on a matter of this kind. But the fact remains, that the birth of Jesus, described in the Gospels, corresponds perfectly, in every particular, with the predictions made by the prophet ages before. And when we take this circumstance in connection with so many other predictions which find their fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth, it is difficult to conceive how intelligent minds can ignore, or treat with ridicule, a subject fraught with world-wide and eternal interest.

Having just seen that the predictions relating to the time, place, and manner of Messiah's Advent, have been accomplished in Jesus Christ, it remains to inquire whether the prophecies descriptive of His character and work, have been realized in an equal degree in Him. On this question a few passages of Scripture must suffice. In one of these Moses announced the coming of a future prophet like himself. (Deut. 18: 18.) On this point we need only remark that Jesus was recognized every where as a great prophet. "This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee," (Matt. 21: 11), "They took

Him for a prophet." (v. 46.) (Confer. Mark 6 : 15, Luke 7 : 16, Luke 24 : 19, John 6 : 14.) That all these and similar passages were written for the mere purpose of making Him appear to fulfill the prophecy of Moses, is untenable, and unreasonable. Any such effort on the part of the Evangelists could have been detected. But a careful study of their statements, shows that they artlessly describe actual occurrences, at which the people spontaneously pronounce Jesus a prophet, or *the prophet*. When they heard His wisdom, they felt the authority with which He spake, and when they saw His wondrous works, they were irresistibly compelled to cry out, "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world." (John 6 : 14.)

His likeness to Moses appears in the dignity of His person. Moses talked face to face with God, while other prophets received their revelations in indirect ways, such as dreams and visions. Jesus says of Himself, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen," (John 8 : 11), or as it is expressed in another place, "I speak that which I have seen with My Father." (John 8 : 28.) These expressions fully harmonize with John's statement, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." (John 1 : 18.)

This likeness further appears in His office of Mediator and Legislator. Moses mediated the Old Testament Covenant between God and man, which involved the giving of the law. In all this he was a type of Christ, and prepared the way for Him to mediate a new and better covenant, and to give a more excellent law. Christ is not only like Moses but superior to him. For the law of Moses was for one nation only and was destined to pass away. The law of Christ is for all nations, and is to be eternal. "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isa. 2 : 3, confer. Isa. 51 : 4.) The law in this passage is nothing else than the Gospel, as the succeeding verse clearly indicates.

Moses, besides being a lawgiver and a prophet, was also a worker of miracles, and a king and priest. So that it was

written of him, "There arose not a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face," etc. (Deut. 34: 10-11.) The prophecies of Moses extended to the destruction of Jerusalem, the overthrow and dispersion of the Children of Israel, and all the calamities which followed the rejection of Christ. And Jesus Himself repeated the same predictions in His own language, adding many particulars, in His prophetic description which enables us to identify, with certainty, the events which fulfilled the prophecies, both of Moses and of Christ.

In all these offices, it is easy to be seen that there is a striking resemblance between Moses and Christ which no honest student can deny.

But again, it was distinctly asserted that the Messiah would verify the truth of His doctrine, and of His claim to divine power and honor, by an appeal to miracles,—“Then the blind eyes shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.” (Isa. 35: 5, 6, confer. Isa. 32: 3, 4, and 29: 18.) These things were literally done by Jesus; and when John sent messengers to inquire of Him whether He was really the coming One, He appealed to these very signs, saying, “Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in Me.” (Matt. 11: 4-6.) Without further quotation it may be added that about fifty times such miracles are reported in the Gospels as having been wrought by Him, in consequence of which the people regarded Him as a great prophet sent from God, in whom God had visited His people; and very many did not hesitate to declare Him the long-promised Messiah.

Quotations from the Old Testament, with corresponding ones from the New Testament, might be multiplied indefinitely, showing that Jesus has completely proved His claim and title

to the Messiahship, by minutely and literally fulfilling the prophecies relating to that long promised and anxiously sought for deliverer. But want of time and space admonish us to hasten to a conclusion. We will therefore only call attention to two or three passages, concerning the sufferings and death of Christ. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah describes the Messiah as a suffering Saviour, a lamb led to the slaughter, without murmuring or complaint; as making His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death; as numbered with the transgressors; as bearing the sins of many, and making intercession for the transgressors. In the second Psalm He cries: "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me" (v. 1). "All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him" (vs. 7, 8). Again (Ps. 16), "My flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (vs. 9, 10).

If now we compare with these predictions the accounts of the death and resurrection of Jesus, recorded in the Gospel histories, how can we conscientiously assert that the coincidences, concurrences and correspondences, discovered between the prophetic utterances of the Old Testament, and the historic statements of the New Testament, are only the happenings of chance, or the manufactured weapons of designing priestcraft? Let it not be forgotten, that the Messianic prophecies were delivered in a fragmentary way, by many different persons, during the long period of fifteen hundred years. And while there is a general and palpable harmony manifested in their utterances, yet some of the descriptions of His person are apparently contradictory; so that some have gone so far as to conjecture that two different persons are described by the prophets. But in the life and sufferings and death of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, the contradictory prophecies are all met and fulfilled. Hence we are shut up to the conclusion that, in the unique and wonderful person of Jesus, we have the Messiah, of whom Moses and the prophets

did write, even in Jesus of Nazareth, *the Son of God*. No other name can be found in universal history whose person and work, in every way, correspond to these prophecies. Nothing less than divine prevision could have foreseen or revealed the historical process which prepared the way for the coming of Christ, and the historical consummation which was reached in Him. And nothing less than divine wisdom and power could have directed and controlled the movements of history, through all vicissitudes and turmoils, so as to subserve His holy purposes. All prophecy centered in Christ and reached its end in Him. Accordingly the prophets must have been impelled by divine inspiration when they wrote, and their writings constitute a series of divine revelations.

VI.

THE ATONEMENT VIEWED FROM THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

BY REV. HIRAM KING.

"The last Adam became a life-giving spirit."

THE doctrine of the Atonement, as might be reasonably expected, was contained already in the Protevangel. "Thou shalt bruise his heel," expressed the measure of the suffering, which the serpent would have power to cause the Deliverer, but the figurative declaration left the passion, as yet, an unknown quantity. The character and remedial efficiency of the infliction, thus early intimated, was, however, made plainer in both the typology of the Hebrew temple ritual and Hebrew prophecy. In these, respectively, the bruising of the heel was foreshadowed and foreshown to mean the actual death of the serpent's Antagonist. Thus, the ceremonial law required the lamb of atonement to be slain as His type, whilst the Prophet saw Him, in prospect, as a lamb brought to the slaughter. That the seed of the woman was meant to sustain a mortal hurt from the serpent is placed beyond doubt and cavil by much of the New Testament Scriptures. "Without shedding of blood is no remission," implies the judicial demand of death for expiation, and the quotation unites the Old Testament and the New. "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sin," explains the memorial significance of the Eucharistic wine, with the assumption of the Lord's prospective death. "The blood of Jesus Christ, his son, cleanseth us from all sin," affirms the sanctifying efficacy of the great death, now compassed.

This, however, is only the negative phase of the doctrine in question. Atonement in this view is *passion*, and he who renders it is *passive*, whilst divine justice cannot be satisfied by the simple endurance of penalty; it demands *restitution*. This principle was, indeed, incorporated in the law of the Hebrew theocracy (Ex. 22), and is at present recognized in criminal jurisprudence, the world over. "He shall bruise thy heel," are the terms in which the Protevangel set forth the positive side of the doctrine of the Atonement, and foretold, thus, the overthrow of the serpent by the Offspring of the woman, whom he had betrayed. Moreover, deliverance from the serpent was, in the nature of the case, the restoration of man to the lordly headship, which he lost in the fall.

The question arises here as to the precise identity of the serpent's successful Assailant. He is prospectively spoken of, and is simply called the seed of the woman. The designation is figurative and is taken from the vegetable kingdom, the reference being to natural generation for the propagation of the race. Does the seed of the woman, in the ultimate sense of a single person, mean an ordinary member of the family of man, a faithful copy of his ancestry, nothing more, nothing less, so as to be truly represented by the well-known fact throughout the vegetable kingdom, that the plant, in the process of generation through its seed, is restricted to the reproduction of its species? Or, more simply, was the Vanquisher of the destroyer meant to be the merely natural offspring of the woman?

The question, as to whether the seed of the woman meant her ordinary child or children, must be answered in the negative from the considerations both of man's sinfulness and of his race constitution. That man is such a criminal as could not hope for mercy, even at a human tribunal, is easily inferred from his responsible position in the earthly system, and from the consequences of his faithlessness to the trust involved. He was created viceroyal, with jurisdiction over organic, if not also over elemental, nature. He lost his princely crown in the garden, and the world failed, in consequence, to become properly a

realm of the great Kingdom of Heaven, for God could reign over the earthly sphere only in the person of man, His true and only representative in nature. The cosmical orders, as is well known, are a unit, their genesis having run along every rising stage from "The Beginning" to "The Garden," to become complete in their head, the brain and mouth of man. Therefore, is the mental and spiritual nature of man the only real point of earthly contact for God, and when this avenue was closed against Him, He could not enter at all to govern and glorify the world. Or, in other words, when the fall deprived man of his viceregal function, his Liege-Lord could no longer extend His sceptre truly into nature, for His reign on earth must be mediated by a viceroy, and that viceroy must be man. Then also, man was placed on sentry duty to guard the world against intrusion—the encroachment, really, of the realm of evil spirits, organized against the Kingdom of Heaven by the mighty prince, whom men call Satan. He was forbidden to seek nourishment on the tree that represented the knowledge of good and evil, with the admonitory disclosure of the deadly consequences of such act. He, nevertheless, plucked and ate of the fatal fruit and betrayed the world he was posted to guard, and which the enemy promptly made the fortified and garrisoned out-post of his empire of evil and darkness and death. And, finally, man was created in the image of God, and was made to bear the divine likeness in his person. Wherefore, he unavoidably involved his Maker in the deepest dishonor when he lost his moral integrity, for it was the divine semblance that the tempter debased into the unspeakable ignominy and unholiness of the fall, and which he, moreover, actually arrayed in arms against its Original.

From all this it appears that man made himself a measureless sinner, and his guilt must also be great beyond the power of mental conception, if it is to be measured by the magnitude of the fatal and endless results of this betrayal of the mightiest trust ever reposed in any one. There can be no doubt that man's great dignity, and the awful disaster that befell the world

through him, form the standard of the divine judgment; nor can less than the doom of death, foretold in paradise, be measured out to the author of such a crime. Can, then, mere man atone for the crime that uncrowned and prostituted the image of God to the fellowship of demons, and converted the earth from paradise to pandemonium?

Mankind are sinners without exception, and, clearly, a sinner cannot render satisfaction for his sins by personal suffering, however great or protracted. The case is not at all in point here of Commonwealth proceedings in the Court of Quarter Sessions against the prisoner in the criminal dock, who, upon being found guilty, in form and manner as he stands indicted, receives sentence to such term of imprisonment as may be the legal equivalent of the infraction of the law, the suffering of the penalty being the criminal's atonement for his crime. Legal justice is satisfied by this sort of criminal procedure, because the lawbreaker is condemned for an *act*, and can not, in the nature of the case, add anything to the crime for which he is punished. Criminal procedure in the Court of Heaven against man is different and involves deeper principles. The transgressor is here arraigned for the crime of sin, which is not an act at all, but a *life*, the pulse-beat of which cannot even be interrupted, except in its total destruction, and this can be effected only in the new creation. Clearly a sinner cannot make atonement, even for himself, by undergoing any degree of punishment, since he unavoidably sins without interruption, and his crime would grow only the greater. There is a profounder reason still, if possible, why the seed of the woman can not be taken as a mere man. The serpent slew the race, who are in themselves "dead in trespasses and sins," and it were clearly not possible for the dead to assail and to overcome their destroyer.

Then also the constitution of the race proves that the Deliverer, referred to in the Protevangel, could not be an ordinary child of the woman. If even, some one man could achieve the impossibility of making atonement for his personal sins, he

certainly could not also render that service for others, and become the redeemer of his race. Such a miracle, at best, could amount only to personal extrication from the consequences of the fall, for the suffering would in no sense be vicarious, nor could the expiation inure to the general benefit, even if the means for applying it existed, which they do not. The only persons who ever represented the human family, were Adam and Eve themselves, for they were generic and fatal for the world's life, and they unavoidably entailed evil on their posterity, because they could not have atoned for the sin, still distinctly their own, so as to recover their lost innocence and purity, and transmit to the world the holy life, which they had received from the breath of God.

Whilst thus, clearly, the Destroyer of the serpent cannot be a mere man, He must, nevertheless, be a real man, for His humanity is distinctly affirmed in His designation as the Offspring of the ancestress of mankind.

Did the "woman" ever bear the "seed"? Eve certainly did not in person, except that she bore the first of a line of the merely human enemies of the serpent, which extended forward, in unbroken succession, from the Garden to the Manger. The singular constitution of the Bible, however—its external duality—unmistakably affirms the appearance of the Descendant of the woman, contemplated in the promise. The former division (O. T.) plainly precedes an event, a fact, which the latter division (N. T.) just as clearly succeeds. The attitude of the one is prospective, that of the other is retrospective. The two focalize, from opposite directions, in a common center. At the focus is a Person. The Old Testament has reference, throughout, to the future birth of this Person—latterly of the Royal House of David. The New Testament, having recorded His nativity, uniformly assumes His advent to have taken place in the ordinary generation of man, and, in reverse of the Old Testament, retraces His ancestral line from his reputed father to the great Hebrew king, and thence to Adam and God. This prospective and retrospective testimony of the Bible to a birth

(the same birth indexed a little later also on the sky for the philosopher and the gentile) is the result of the unity of redemptive revelation and the common inspiration of the record. It was, indeed, "the fulness of the time" (the birth of Christ), as this was the aim and purpose of all that preceded, that drew forth the proclamation of the Protevangel, itself, and reared the line of altars, that smoked from Eden to Calvary, at which Patriarch and Hebrew priest offered sacrifice to Jehovah in symbolic atonement for sin. The incarnation equally produced and inspired the Old Testament Scriptures and the New, the former in preparation, the latter in sequence. The Scriptures, being the expression and effect of the incarnation, are held together in the life and inspiration of this common fact. The Protevangel unfolded into the Old Testament economy, and is, therefore, a great finger, pointing forward out of paradise along the line of the Ark, the Covenant, the Lamb of Atonement, the Mercy-seat and Bethlehem. The Gospel is the fulfillment of its prophecy in the Garden, and is, therefore, the finger of God pointing backward on the line of the empty sepulchre, the vacated cross and Bethlehem. One need but follow the way from either direction, here pointed out by the indices on the Guide-Board of the ages, and he will come to the manger and the birth.

The Old and New Testaments bear also literal testimony to the advent of this Person. At the Annunciation, the angel directed Mary to call the son, Jesus, whom she should conceive and bear, and the name itself indicates His successful struggle with the serpent, and thus distinguished Him as the promised seed. In his announcement of the birth of a Saviour, the angel brought the shepherds "good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people," and so was fulfilled the promise to Abraham, that in him should "all families of the earth be blessed." "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," is the Lord's sign, declared by the prophet Isaiah to King Ahaz, and Matthew quotes the prophecy as about to be fulfilled in the birth of Jesus. And,

lastly, the birth-place, itself, as recorded in the New Testament, was the fulfillment of an Old Testament prophecy, as pointed out to Herod by the Chief Priests and Scribes.

All this, now, proves the true humanity of the Deliverer; is He also divine? The Protevangel throws no light on the question beyond justifying the inference that one, who would be able to overthrow the serpent, must needs be also supernatural. His divinity was, however, announced directly from heaven, for the angel explained to the shepherds that the newly-born Saviour was "Christ the Lord." Then, also, John defines the incarnation as the *Word made flesh*, having set forth the doctrine of the Logos in the preface,—that He is eternal and identical with God, the Maker of all things, the Fountain of life and the Source of light to men. "I and my Father are one" is the Lord's personal affirmation of His divinity. "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," is the recognition of His divinity by the Eternal Father.

Is the Lord sinless as well as divine? The law of natural generation, unfailingly, entails sin on the race at the inception of life. No human device has ever been invented to eliminate the foreign and associated factor of evil from the law of the propagation of the human species. Was the life of sin negated in the conception of our Lord? The Catholic church has sought a settlement of the difficulty for itself by exempting the Lord's mother from hereditary and all sin. Pope, Pius IX, proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary on December 8, 1854, which is declared by the papal bull, *Ineffabilis Deus*, to be a divinely revealed fact, and must thereafter be believed in by all Catholics on pain of excommunication. Here are the exact words of the famous decree: "That the most blessed Virgin Mary, in the first moment of her conception, by a special grace and privilege of Almighty God, in virtue of the merits of Christ, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin." In view of the long growing disposition among Catholics to unduly exalt the mother of the Lord, the suspicion may be justified, that this extravagant

dogma was promulgated vastly more in the interest of Mariolatry, than from any considerations of honor, thought due the incarnation. At all events, as the sinless conception of the Virgin Mary, herself, is here made an article of faith for Catholics, the difficulty is only pushed back a lineal degree, and instead of growing smaller by the transfer, it increases manifold. All is relegated to the merely human realm. The generation is purely natural. The complementary elements of the conception are human and sin-tainted. Nor is there a hint, anywhere given, of a divine intervention for the sanctification of this life at its inception.

The Lord's conception was not in all respects natural. It was a miracle, wrought, no doubt, on a natural basis. That it was miraculous may safely be inferred from the fact that the seminal principle must have been supplied, or rendered unnecessary by a creative act. This view is certainly justified by the circumstances of the Annunciation. The announcement to Mary, that she should conceive and bring forth a son, was a paradox from the standpoint of her virginity. She consequently asked for an explanation. "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" The angel replied simply, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." This declaration meant, of course, that God would provide, in an act of creation through His Spirit, for the lack of conceptive complementation in the absence of the marital relation. Surely, this is miraculous. Why not then conceive of the simple extension of the miraculous agency, so as to hold in abeyance, and prevent the entailment of, both physical and moral, evil in the conception of the Lord? Indeed, as much as this seems to be implied in the conclusion, which the angel drew from the manner of the conception. "Therefore," he says, "also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The child should be "holy," it should be called the "Son of God." The Immaculate Conception of Jesus is, consequently, a truer legend than that incorporated in the Roman creed concerning

His mother, and needs no Pontifical rescript to make it binding on the Christian conscience. These references, bearing on the sinlessness of Christ are sufficient: "Who knew no sin," "Who did no sin," "But was in all points tempted like as we, yet without sin," "Offered himself without spot to God."

The Lord's person is *theanthropic*. The fatherhood of God and the motherhood of man are concurrent at the manger, and the infant Tenant is equally divine and human. He is, moreover, without the ordinary birth-taint of sin. As this dual constitution of the person of Christ is the consummation of the divine design, we may inquire as to the purpose. The principle is recognized among all people, savage and civil, that punishment is justified only in the *identity* of the criminal. This law of natural justice is the reflection, everywhere in the moral constitution of the world, of the infinite justice of God. He, who would make satisfaction for man, must be a man. Then again, the terms of the Protevangel, as subsequently explicated, required the physical death of the Deliverer, and one must be merely human, or assume human nature, to die at all. Besides, man's deliverance was meant to be self-wrought. The posterity of the woman should conquer the foe. The humanity, that had sinned, must be at least a factor in the work of the Atonement throughout. But wherein lies the necessity of the divinity of the Redeemer? Shall we say that as a mere man He would have been unable to endure the penalty for sin? And that the penal exigencies of the contemplated deliverance made His divinity necessary? Hardly, for it is precisely the extreme punishment for sin that the unrepentant and unsaved will have to bear in eternity. No, the purpose and effect of the incarnation was immensely broader than this. "The Word was made flesh" for the *new creation of man*. A new Eden was added to the world's geography at Bethlehem. A new paradise was planted with the tree of life in the midst of it. A "new man" was made the tenant of the garden to "dress it and to keep it." The union of the divine and human natures in a person, in conception and birth, was the evolution of a

new fatherhood for the race, for He who lay in the manger is the "Last Adam"—the Generic Source of an essentially sinless, spiritual and immortal life for the world. From the person of this second and last Progenitor of man should spring the race of the first Adam anew, to replenish the new earth, now swung in immortal orbit above the ruins of the old.

The humanity of Christ carries in itself the human agency in man's deliverance; does the divinity of Christ involve the divine self-satisfaction? Certainly not. The incarnation is not Tri-Personal. The very explanation of the mystery to Mary is tripartite,—the power of the *highest* should overshadow her, the *Holy Ghost* should come upon her, the *Son of God* should be born of her. The rigid monotheism of the Jewish rulers made the Lord's alleged blasphemy a capital offence, nor had an atonement been at all possible without a personal distinction in the Godhead. Personal accountability, justice, satisfaction, penalty,—in all of these, plurality of persons and personal relations are necessarily involved. The mystery of the Manger is not the overwrought monotheism of the Jews, nor is it Trinitarian; but the Second Person of the Trinity has assumed both man's nature and the responsibility for man's sin. God is incarnate in only one person, and the divine justice can be satisfied in the personal distinction by a proper atonement.

We have now identified the seed of the woman as the Eternal Son of God, become the spiritual Ancestor of man in an incarnation. Was it not sufficient for Him to assume our nature without the lineal taint of sin? Could not His divine-human person, as thus constituted, become at once the ancestral fountain of the world's life?

The Protevangel discloses the Deliverer, not only in combat with the serpent, but as receiving the sting of the serpent's tooth in His heel, and the wound is subsequently shown to be mortal, by both sacrifice and seer. Although our Lord's conception by the Holy Ghost was the regeneration of our nature for Him, it still implicated Him in the general fact of the fall quite as really as if His birth had been ordinary. The prince

of Hell, in a sense, procured His exclusion from paradise, and the cherubim of Heaven guarded its gates to prevent His approach to the tree of life. He must, therefore, extricate Himself from this double implication, both as an individual and as the Generic Head of the race, which He means to save. The necessity is easily inferred from the belligerent attitude of the mighty foes, foreshown in paradise. The birth of Christ was the inauguration, in full, of the war of the Colossi. Giants truly they are, each a foeman worthy of the other's steel. The serpent made the first attempt, at the great Epiphany, to destroy the life of his strange Enemy, and the Lord seemed at his mercy; for, being truly human, He experienced the common helplessness of infancy; but the Father watched over the cradle of the Son, and an angel directed His removal to Egypt to foil the murderous intent, brought to expression in the political jealousy of King Herod. The first act of the great war-drama was, therefore, not a battle at all; for the serpent's purpose was to forestall and prevent the combat in the destruction of his yet powerless Enemy. A special providence made the fell attempt abortive, and the slaughter of the Innocents became the bloody prophecy of the defeat and doom of its reptilian instigator. In the temptation, the antagonists met face to face for a trial of strength. The encounter was wholly moral, and the world's entire interests were once more at issue. The Last Adam was in the new garden and on probation. He met the foe, before whom the First Adam fell, to restore what was lost in the first paradise. He was led to the scene of the Devil's approach by the Spirit, whom the Father breathed in benison on the Son at His baptismal consecration to the work of restitution. In a last resort by the tempter, He was tendered the vast results of forty centuries of the world's historical development, as the price of His loyalty to Heaven. "Get thee hence, Satan!" was the prompt self-vindication of the Lord's moral integrity, as it was also the repulse of His assailant. Thus, the effort of the Devil to seduce the Lord, when under moral responsibility

for the race, failed as signally as his attempt to murder Him, when an infant, had proved abortive.

Was Satan the author of the crucifixion? The Sanhedrim, in adopting the policy set forth in the ghastly prophecy of Caiaphas, that "one man should die for the people," virtually condemned the Lord to death from the time at which He raised Lazarus to life. This same Council, being the highest authority remaining to the Jews under the Roman conquest, constrained Pontius Pilate to sentence Him to the cross. But then Satan evidently aided and abetted the Lord's natural enemies in their schemes for His destruction. "Then Satan," we are told, "entered into Judas Iscariot, being of the twelve. And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them." Satan became unmistakably associated with the rulers in their plots against Christ; for he actually entered Judas, who betrayed his Master under the diabolical inspiration. The ancient enemy of the Lord may then be said to have put Him to death, as the inspiring agency, under the outward forms of the ecclesiastical and civil courts, and the cross signalizes his success; does it also proclaim his triumph?

The Protevangel implies that the hurt, to be inflicted by the serpent, though mortal, would not prove fatal, the death of Christ being represented as only a wound in the heel. The Lord's singular utterance at the point of death may well have alarmed His would-be destroyer, for it was clearly not a cry of distress, wrung from the sufferer, but a shout of victory. The declaration, "It is finished," was a proclamation, and referred, not to the consummation of Satan's murderous designs, but to the accomplishment of the Lord's purpose on the cross. The Lord's death was, indeed, voluntary, and yet not suicidal, any more than that of the patriot, who gives his life for the land he loves. "No man taketh it from me," saith the Lord of His life, "but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." Although an act of His free will, the Lord's death was fully justified by

the purpose of the self-offering. He died in behalf of man. He is the Lamb "slain from the foundation of the world" for man's reconciliation to God. He is the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." The Lord's expiatory suffering for sin was ended in the anciently appointed doom of death, and Satan insured his own everlasting overthrow in procuring the betrayal and crucifixion.

Was Satan alone the author of the Lord's passion? The serpent's sting in the Lord's heel represents the consequences of sin in the sense and degree in which man fell under the power of his betrayer. Was the Lord's agony on the cross augmented beyond the power of Satan to produce suffering through the medium of man's sin? The expression, "It is finished," can be best explained in the light of the earlier cry of distress, uttered in the words of the twenty-second psalm, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This evidently reveals a new source of anguish, which appears to have been opened only at the cross. The Father forsook the Son, and the negative element of the divine abandonment filled the troubled soul of the Sufferer with the utmost darkness and horror. This was expiation under the infliction of penalty. The Lord, though personally without sin, was by implication under the burning focus of God's wrath against all sin. He represented man as fully and truly as if He had been standing in the character of Adam, himself, at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, plucking the forbidden fruit in person. These passages will leave no doubt on this point; He "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," He was made "a curse for us."

Did the Father, then, forsake the Son in anger? No, the Lord was the "Beloved Son" equally at the baptism and on the cross. The Father denied Him His presence, for an instant, at the demand of justice, which craved satisfaction for the assumed sin.

The important question ought to be asked here, as to how Christ could be made chargeable with the fall of man? Not at all, we answer, in any mechanical transfer of moral responsi-

bility from mankind to Himself. It is clearly impossible for one man to assume the responsibility, before God, of another man's offenses. But then Christ is not related to the human family as men are related to one another. He was not born as an additional unit in the ceaseless multiplication of Adam's race, but His incarnation made Him the Fountain of spiritual life for the new birth of Adam and his posterity, together. It was in the character of the "Last Adam," that He became unavoidably, though also voluntarily, responsible for the crimes of the first Adam. In becoming Generic for the race, He necessarily assumed the nature of man into such intimate relation with Himself, as to make the incarnation equivalent to an original headship. With the priority of a progenitor, He represented the moral phase of man's life, in the temptation and on the cross, as really as if He alone existed and all the race were actually to proceed, subsequently in time, from His person. It is true, that the headship of Christ over man, was established after many generations had passed away, but the same thing is true, also, of the Atonement, and yet no one doubts that the efficacy of the death of Christ must retroact from Calvary to Eden. According to the same principle, the headship of Christ acts backward from the Manger to the Garden, and carries in itself the moral responsibility of all the world as truly as Adam stands for man, as the first fountain of human life.

The key to the Lord's psychic suffering is not found in the Protevangel, but in the consequent penalty for sin, which was foretold before its commission: "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The Lord was born as the potential Head of the race, and He could assume the efficient headship only in His personal self-extrication from the inimical environments of His birth. It was necessary for Him to bear the human nature, which He had received from Mary, along every stage of man's fallen fortunes. His pathway to Pentecost (the cradle of the new-born humanity) lay from Christmas along Good Friday and Easter. Man was the victim of death—the death of the body and the profounder death of the soul.

This duplex death would issue at last in the "second death." This doom must be assumed by man's Deliverer. Did Jesus suffer both temporal and eternal death? Did He fathom the downward movement of man in the fall?

The sacrificial symbol and prophecy that proclaim the sting in the heel to be vicarious, also prove the Lord's passion to have been commensurate with man's crime. He was man's Vicar, or Substitute, according to Isaiah: "And the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," and "with his stripes we are healed." See also 1 Peter 2: 24. The claims of divine justice and the malice of Satan drew to a common focus at the cross. The serpent's deepest wound and God's greatest penal infliction were coincident on the person of the Crucified One, which was singular and out of character, as our natural life carries in itself, ordinarily, but the beginning of punishment, while the full measure of penalty for sin is reserved for the future existence. That the wicked often escape the ills of life, which the good endure, is a fact of the commonest observation. Does the fuller suffering begin at death? The double point is finely illustrated in the parable against the worldly. The rich man's earthly estate was as enjoyable as that of Lazarus was miserable, but the former promptly endured penal torment after death for the worldly life which he had led. Nature is a curtain, hung between man and God, and the "world to come" is the theatre of the final recompense of evil. The Lord was, however, "put to death in the flesh." He "suffered for us in the flesh," and He must, consequently, have paid the extreme penalty for sin in *this* life. Hell is the unmistakable doom of the sinner. Did the Lord experience it?

The great psychic passion was separated into the two periods of Gethsemane and Calvary, but the division was substantially one of degree only. The troubled voice of the Sufferer was heard in each period as it rose out of the darkness to God. The Lord's prayers were, in some sort the measure of the agony, which they represented. That in Gethsemane could have been extorted from Him only under the frown of God, which began

to fill His soul with a rayless horror, of which the physical darkness, that drew over Calvary, was but the faintest suggestion. He was, indeed, in the words of His own declaration in the Olive garden, "sorrowful, even unto death," and, surely, the anticipation of the physical dissolution, which He was about to suffer, could not have weighed so heavily upon Him. It was the wrath of God already burning fiercely against the focalized sin of the world, which He was bearing to the cross, that made Him utter the contingent prayer for the removal of the cup, which He conceded Himself to have come to drink at that very "hour." It was that fearful deluge of mighty anguish, breaking over His soul from the lost garden, that wrung from His lips the petition, that might suggest the momentary disturbance of His eternal purpose of self-sacrifice. His prayer was not answered by the removal of the cup from His lips, but He was not even yet drinking its bitterest contents. Communication with the heavenly world was still open, and the Father sent an angelic messenger to strengthen His suffering Son. Calvary became, at once the climax of Gethsemane and the culmination of the passion. The physical suffering, which began with the brutal beating and the derisive coronation reached its greatest intensity on the cross, and the mental torture of Gethsemane became the utmost anguish at Golgotha. The key to the situation, therefore, is no longer the pitiful prayer for the removal of the cup from the quivering lips; but the terrible cry that rose out of the preternatural darkness, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" is here the index of the completeness of the self-offering and the penal fullness of the passion. The Sufferer had at this point virtually reached the final stage of man's existence. He was "made sin" and was held responsible for evil in its ultimate earthly scope; in its deepest and deadliest depravity; in its world-embracing enthrallment; in its defiance of God. He was the world's Great Unforgiven, and He prayed not for pardon. The nearest approach that He ever made to such a petition was the enigmatical prayer in Gethsemane. Nor could he crave forgiveness, for He knew the boon to be be-

yond the gift of His Father, and petition without faith were mockery and not prayer. Sin is unpardonable in the sense here under consideration, and must, necessarily, have been borne to the point of expiation for its removal, and expiation (in full for man) was possible only within the scope of the "second death." As when the divine glory broke in heavenly effulgence over the Mount of Transfiguration, the Lord bore our nature into Heaven for a season; so also, when physical nature, with trembling fingers, drew the veil of her darkness over Calvary, and the divine frown focalized in total eclipse upon the cross, did the Lord bear our nature, virtually, into Hell for a space. That the Lord actually took man's place under the final penalty for sin is easily seen from His application of the opening sentiment of the twenty-second Psalm to His position at the time. The Father had "forsaken" Him. Communication with the upper world was interrupted. All practical sympathy was then in abeyance. Not even an angel appeared with heavenly consolation. Surely, this portrays, also, the condition of the unforgiven in the world to come, for, what can constitute the torments of Hell but the withdrawal of the light, the life, the presence of God. "It is finished," therefore, announced the accomplishment of the Sufferer's purpose of vicarious expiation.

Was the deliverance of man wrought at the cross? The Lord was passive and under unresented infliction from Gethsemane to the sepulchre. He fell as a non-combatant before the deadly assault of the enemy. The cross, bearing the dead Christ on Good-Friday evening, represented murder, but it also forecast the overthrow of the felonious perpetrators, for, conversely, the crucifixion guaranteed the approaching triumph of the Slain. The cross is the emblem of reconciliation, but not of salvation. "For if when we were enemies," says the apostle, "we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." The Lord was put to physical death, but He suffered not spiritual death, the "second death" having no power over Him except to involve Him in the agony of the lost. The Father forsook Him to drink this last and

bitterest drop of the cup of penal suffering, but He was all the while, truly, "the life." This recalls the important fact, that, whilst suffering for sin is negative, and, in itself, does not overthrow the evil one, the Protevangel foretold an actual struggle in which the seed of the woman was to crush the serpent's head. In the hostility, resulting from the implanted enmity, the Lord had hitherto pursued the policy of foiling His foe, or of non-resistance. He assailed him only indirectly, as in His general teaching and in the expulsion of his "legions" from his physical stronghold of demoniacal possession. The language used in the Garden evidently contemplated a direct and overwhelming counter-assault from the woman's seed. This positive conflict took place *after* the passion, because the Lord's personal qualification for the struggle could be derived only from personal expiation. He could "destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" only "through death," because, as the Lamb of God, He bore the sin of the world to the cross and relieved Himself of the incumbrance, which had also been the constant source of Satan's power over Him. Truly the Protevangel was fulfilled by means of the tragedy that was enacted for the Lord's destruction. The cross both equipped the seed of the woman for the final encounter, and introduced Him into the earthly stronghold of the serpent, which is death. The battle was joined in the region of the dead, and He, who had died so meekly on Good-Friday, presently reappeared in life, displaying as trophies of final victory, "the keys of death and of Hades." A heavenly messenger also exposed the empty sepulchre to view, and sat as it were, in derision on the broken seal of Rome. It was Easter-Day, the world's Easter, for the last Adam was risen from the dead to save, "by His life," the race, which He had "reconciled to God" by His death.

VII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

A TRIED STONE.

"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat."—St. Luke xxii. 31.

SECTION I.

The Messiah's Preparation for Death.

WHEN Jesus of Nazareth was persuaded that however forcible and convincing His preaching, reasoning and miracles might be, the public would none the less reject Him, on account of their bearings, so unpalatable to the natural mind, He, the last and greatest of her prophets, prepared to obey the will of God and close forever the Jewish church. There was no help for His enemies in man, solely, nor for the apostles, not even in their peerless Messiah. He must be declared by His resurrection and ascension to be the eternal Son of God incarnate, before friend or foe, His people or the world could be helped by Him. In short, Judaism must give way to Christianity.

His first disciple, Peter, who was appointed to begin to unfold the doctrine of the Trinity, which Moses had wrapped up in the declaration, "Hear, O Israel: the LORD our God is one LORD," and who had accordingly declared with all the fervor of his earnest spirit, "Thou art the Son of the living God," had also, when his Master thereupon announced his approaching violent death, with the same fervor exclaimed, "Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee!"

And yet "to this end He was born, and for this cause He came into the world!" Simon's words were tantamount to a request of the Christ to deny Himself, and therefore his Master's sudden repulse, "Get thee hence, Satan." It also proved that Peter was wholly ignorant of the extent and value of his own confession. This was indeed with him a firm and honest conviction, for he spake by the Holy Ghost; but it was not yet an assured knowledge which entered into and formed a part of his own consciousness. It could not be, till Jesus, by the full or perfect descent of the Spirit, should be declared "the Son of God with power."

Simon's words came, he knew not whence, till the Master told him; and, at that time, he knew just as little whither they reached; for it was not always given to those who spake by the Spirit of God to understand their own utterances. And yet, though the earnest rebuke, "Be it far from thee, Lord," disclosed that Peter had no knowledge of Jesus as a Saviour, it also served the good purpose of showing that he had no real apprehension of the facts of sin and himself as a sinner, all of which are necessary to make a true Israelite, such as the Messiah had promised he should become in naming him Cephas. Though the Holy Ghost had shown him Jesus Christ as the sinless Son of man, He had not yet shown him Simon Bar-Jona as a son of the first and last Adam. Consequently, Simon was wholly insensible of sin and Satan. Once, indeed, his baptism of awakening so far prevailed, that, astonished at a miracle of the Master's, he exclaimed, "I am a sinful man, O Lord," but the only effect it produced on him was fear, and prompted by this fear he had also prayed Him, "Depart from me." Had he known himself to be a sinner thoroughly lost, and Jesus to be a Saviour, he would have begged Him to stay with him forever, for the very reason that he was such, and without His presence must continually fall.

Preaching and miracles were not enough to teach the disciples, any more than the enemies of Christ. Acts of another kind were needed. His departure in the body, and return in

the spirit could alone quicken and perfect their knowledge and faith. These acts Peter had but now opened the way for, both by his confession and remonstrance. While the former strengthened their Master's resolution to leave them in order to return again, the latter accelerated His steps in going. Neither to suffer nor die, but to take the kingdom before God should put it into His hands, was the very temptation of Satan, a temptation which the Son of David, like His father David, nobly and promptly resisted.

It was time for the Messiah to die, when the chief disciple, through the grand conviction of His personality, and amazing ignorance of himself, was fast becoming a tempter. Not eight days after this, when Jesus took "Peter and James and John" "up into a high mountain apart," to have their faith confirmed by His transfiguration, Peter, in an ecstasy, desired their Lord to tabernacle with them there; so quickly had He forgotten His communication that He "must go to Jerusalem to suffer and be killed," and His rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" So little did he understand the true object of His coming—as little as the Jews who thought the Christ must "abide forever" in His mortal nature as the Son of David, when all their sacrifices pointed to His death! "I have never eaten anything common nor unclean," Saint Peter could say, so strictly had he observed the ceremonial law, and yet all its washing and cleansing, and slaying and sacrificing, pointed to the facts of sin present and a Saviour to come. Truly that law was as powerless, in his case, to convince him of sin, as it was in the case of those who were convinced, to make them "perfect as pertaining to the conscience." The time had indeed come for the great Paschal Lamb to be slain, and therefore Jesus the Christ, both high priest and sacrifice, began at once to prepare for the plain and public confession of His undeputed and inherent divinity; that truth which alone could secure His condemnation to death, and afterward raise Him again to life and glory.

SECTION II.

His Discourses with the Jews.

Christ's Sonship (twofold) was a continual stumbling-block to the Jews, for it was always coming up, forced upon them either by His teaching, or preaching, or miracles. The eternal was more strongly impressed upon them than the mortal, for only by a firm adherence to the former could the Messiah bring about His death as the latter, and at the same time be guiltless of His and their blood by letting them know "plainly" "who" He was. Had He wavered in the least from His unmistakable intimations that He was the eternal Son of God, and that, of course, by generation, they could not have taken Him with intent to kill. The title "Son of God," apart from this peculiar meaning attached to it by Christians, could not have offended them, for in one sense it is applicable to all men, since all were originally created in Adam, and are the children of God by His continuous creation and preservation. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." Angels and archangels, prophets, apostles, and all believers are also called the sons of God by vocation and adoption. Had the Messiah, then, as He stood before the Jews, a man of flesh, and blood, and mortal, admitted that He was merely a being of special Divine *creation* and calling, they had not dared to accuse or condemn Him. Or, had He even claimed to be an angel or archangel in disguise, they could not have objected, for they were accustomed to the idea of these presenting themselves to men in human form, visiting and abiding with them (as "the angel of the LORD"), whilst the names of "Gabriel" and "Michael" were familiar to them as household-words. That a great prophet like Jesus should call himself the Son of God, would have excited no surprise nor antagonism in the Jews. That title, at its highest, would never to them have signified generation.

This, Jesus very well knew, and therefore He was always

careful not to say to them in so many words, "I am the Son of God."* This might have been interpreted to mean the same in His case as in that of many others. On the contrary, He did more. He called God His "Father;" and not only this, but "*My Father*," in the sense of generation as the Jews understood. Thus "He made Himself," as they said truly, "*equal*," or of one substance with God.† He did not *call*, but (leaving them to draw the inference) "*made Himself the Son of God*," and provoked them to anger by forcing them to put His intimation into these plain words. Precisely this inference it was that made them so desirous, and it possible, for them to take Him to put to death. Hence, when they charged Him with it to the face, He neither denied nor explained it away, but proceeded to talk on that assumption. Later,‡ determined to draw them out still more (because anxious that He and they should be guiltless of each other's blood), He endeavored to prove to them His highest Sonship by His works. "Many good works have I shown you from my Father," He said; and then as they took up stones, He asked ironically, "for which of those works do you stone me?" And the Jews again answered frankly and truly: "For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."

At that point they saw that He did not make Himself merely the *Son* of God, but "*God*;" that is, not only God of one *substance*, or essence with, but also of one *nature*, or *eternal* with the Father. At last they had put His teachings into words, clear and concise as a creed! He had claimed to be true or perfect man, and true or perfect God! And the Messiah, delighted (though it would insure His death), instead of denying their conclusion, only pressed it more strongly and beseechingly: "If I do not the-works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not *me*, believe the

* Except where He used it, as in St. John x. 36, in the sense of the Messiah.

† St. John v. 18.

‡ St. John x. 32, 33.

works" (accepting their reason before their love) "that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me and I in Him." This would have saved them from destruction. But this, in their eyes, was worse than blasphemy; and from a man of His powers it was more than madness; and now being willingly confirmed in their persuasion, "He hath a devil," they sought to take him: but "he escaped out of their hand."

The Jews knew that Jesus was not mad, and their law against blasphemy was imperative; hence they sought to kill Him. But they also knew He had not "a devil," and therefore, in spite of their law, they should have believed "the works," for these, they could not deny, were always "good;" and, being good and done in His own name—"I say unto thee"—they proved Him to be in the highest sense the Son of God, of one substance and one nature with "the Father."

SECTION III.

Christ before the Council.

Not only in His public arguments with the Jews, but in His trial before the Sanhedrin, Jesus of Nazareth held unswervingly to this same charge on their part, and claim on His, of eternal generation. Had He not on this occasion in the answers, "Thou sayest," and "I am," pleaded guilty to the high priest's arraignment, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of God?" "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" the council, too, would not have been able to sentence Him. Here the high priest, as the representative of the Most High, solemnly adjured Him "by the living God." And by "the living God" they meant the eternal and uncreated, or self-existent God (in distinction from the dead or created gods of the heathen around them) and known to the Jews by the name of Jehovah. He adjured Him to tell them whether He was the Son of *this* God, or of Jehovah; including in the charge both accusations of co-essential and co-eternal divin-

ity. And to this Jesus, now on oath, answered; which, when not on oath, He had several times declined to do. He answered "plainly;" the words "Thou hast said," and "Thou sayest," being equivalent to "Yea." He also "confessed and denied not," but affirmed, "I am the Christ" (the sinless Messiah of the Jews), and "the Son of the living God" (the incarnate LORD of the Gentiles). Out of His own mouth He was condemned, as they said and again truly—"What need we any further witnesses? for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth."

The eternal and begotten Son of Jehovah, was the meaning the high priest and the council attached to the words, "the Son of God," and the Son of the Blessed," as Jesus confessed them. Many professing to be the Christ had come before, and many professing to be such were to follow after Jesus of Nazareth; for a prophet, then, of His rank, to claim to be the Messiah would have excited no surprise in the mind of the high priest; nor, claiming to be such, would it have filled him with indignation to hear Him assert that He was the Son of God in the sense of having been sent from God (like John the Baptist or any of the older prophets) to be a Teacher, and even a Worker of wonderful miracles. The Jews had exalted views of their Messiah. They expected Him to be all this, as well as a King, the Son of David. He was to be pre-eminently the Son of God in being, unlike others, who were anointed by their fellows, "anointed of the LORD:" and He was to "abide forever." Had the high priest, then, understood no more than this by the words, "Thou sayest," and "I am," he would not have "rent his clothes, saying, he hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye?" nor would the council have responded, "He is guilty of death." The claim of being the "Son of God" in this lower sense, was not the stumbling-block of the Jews. They would have been willing to accept their Messiah and King as lifted above all others in being sent of God even to be the Saviour of the world.

It would have accorded with their pride that all nations should look to Him, for they had been long enough God's chosen people to believe and boast that "salvation is of the Jews." The trouble lay deeper than this. It lay in the fact that Jesus claimed to be equal with Jehovah! This highest Divinity was the rock which the Jews, horror-struck, saw before them; and against this their Messiah was driven by the hatred of His enemies, the pressure of the church, the will of the Father, and His own firm adherence to the truth.

SECTION IV.

Jesus Delivered to Pilate.

With the exception of their false testimony, Christ's enemies had, so far, been honest and truthful, and Jesus accordingly answered before them the virtual question, "Whence art thou?" which, later, He declined to answer before Pilate. But now came into play the baser part of their natures. Having taken and tried Him by night (probably for fear of the people), and pronounced Him "guilty of death," "straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate," their ultimate object being to have Him crucified; though death by stoning was their penalty for blasphemy. Stoning, however, they had often tried on Jesus of Nazareth, and never succeeded, He having always avoided the stones, and escaped from their hands. Suppose He should, by another miracle, disappear this time also?

At all events, they were bound to obtain the consent of Pilate to kill Him, and therefore to Pilate they led Him; and when he naturally and rightly asked, "What accusation bring ye against this man?" they evaded the question by saying, "If he were not a malefactor we would not have delivered him unto thee?" "Take ye him," promptly answered Pilate, "and judge him according to your law." But the Jews, now

compelled by their own artifice to acknowledge the hated Roman authority, and who, in any other case, would have grasped at this liberty to execute their own laws, meekly replied, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." They were not so scrupulous as to the lawfulness of the act when they afterward put Stephen to death, for "with one accord, they ran upon him, and cast him out of the city, and stoned him," without stopping to ask the consent or approval of the civil authorities.

Obliged to present an accusation here, they charged: "We found this man perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, and saying that himself is Christ a king:" all of which were distortions of the truth. Besides these, "the chief priests and elders accused Him of many things," but to them "he answered never a word." Not even, when Pilate, greatly marvelling, said: "Answerest thou nothing? behold, how many things they witness against thee," did He speak. All were false, and not one was their real reason for desiring His crucifixion. Pilate knew it, and that "for envy they had delivered him," and now, roused to bring their malice to light, he said, "I find no fault in him. But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the Passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the king of the Jews, or Barabbas?" (who was a robber and a murderer). They said, "Barabbas." "What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?" he asked. "They all say unto him, Let him be crucified." "Why, what evil hath he done?" pursued the governor. "But they cried out the more, Crucify him! Crucify him!" "Take ye him, and crucify him," returned Pilate indignantly (meaning that he would not), "for I find no fault in him." This they dared not do without his approval and command, and, driven to the last extremity, they were forced to tell the truth:—"We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God."

At this, Pilate should have answered in all sincerity, Then take Him, and deal with Him according to that law: I per-

mit it. And no doubt the Jews trembled lest he should, for after that there could be no further appeal. They would be obliged to stone Him, or, finding that impossible, to let Him go. But the confession—"he made himself the Son of God"—had caused Pilate, in his turn, to tremble. Being a Gentile and a Roman, Pilate was accustomed to the idea of incarnating gods, and deifying men. Consequently this sounded to him like the truth, and leaving the Jews he hastened to Jesus with the great question, "Whence art thou?" "And from thenceforth he sought to release him."

The Jews, on the other hand, had, in the meantime, recovered their self-possession, and now, realizing equally their danger and their opportunity, raised their voices and cried out incessantly, "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend!" "Whoso maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cæsar!" "We have no king but Cæsar!" And weak, vacillating Pilate, fearing the loss of his position, distracted by the threats of the Jews, the silence of Jesus, and the mystery of the Christ, was undone. The price of his peace, popularity and place, was the Messiah's crucifixion. And, after the formal ceremony of washing his hands to declare his innocence, "he delivered him unto them to be crucified," but not without insisting that the superscription of His cross should be what, to him "Jesus of Nazareth" admitted He was—"The King of the Jews." Pilate's sin was in allowing Jesus to be put to death illegally, but the sin of Caiaphas, and the council, and the multitude, was in forcing Pilate to authorize this illegal act. Hence, Jesus, pitying him as a heathen born and reared, said to him in his perplexity, "Thou couldst have no power against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he" (the high priest) "that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin."

SECTION V.

His Temptations.

When tried, Jesus was also tempted, for trial and temptation go together. The one always pre-supposes the other. As a man who delighted in His mission to go "about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil," Jesus did shrink from dying, from being "cut off" in the midst of His days, "out of the land of the living." He also shrank from dying by the hands of a lawless and riotous mob, for He was the Prince of peace. But far more He dreaded death by stoning, for that was the death of a blasphemer; and still more He dreaded death by crucifixion, since this was, for Him, the death forsaken of God: "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

By the method, then, which the devil, who tempted Him as he tempts all men, must have suggested, the Messiah could have avoided the death He so much dreaded. It was only necessary to suppress or withhold a part of the truth—that great part of it that He was the Son of God by generation. Had He, when accused by the Jews of making Himself co-equal and co-eternal with God, wavered in the least from the extent of this claim, they could not have taken, nor the council condemned, Him. Being, as the Son of man, of Adam, and David, and Mary, a created being, He could have signified in the high priest's palace that He was the Son of God by special and miraculous creation; and no doubt Satan, whose hour of triumph had come, did, by vividly and actively picturing before Him the terrors of the cross, torment Him to make use of this subterfuge. But there, the "Faithful and True Witness" not only refused to deny the great truth, or merely intimate it, or altogether hold His peace. None of these would have been enough under the circumstances. Had He not at that time, and in that place, openly acknowledged that in His essential natures He was highest God as well as high-

est man, He would have sinned, and become guilty of the souls of all men, for the high priest and council would still have been in doubt, and the Jews deprived of their last plea—the plea of blasphemy—which alone availed with Pilate to place Him in their hands.

The great truth of His eternal generation, the Messiah did occasionally suppress, but this was because the Jews stooped for stones at hints of His Divinity, and His death, after that manner, would have been without virtue as an atonement. In the counsels of God, the death of the Messiah *upon the tree* had been the appointed means for lifting the primal curse from the world, and in the endurance of it He was to combine the glorious characters of martyr and Saviour. Hence when they threatened Him with stones, Jesus either abated His arguments, or “hid himself from them,” or “escaped out of their hand.” But when they started the cry of “Crucify him”—those words on which the salvation of the world and the fate of its Saviour depended—He submitted to them, for then His hour was come. Pilate’s question, “Whence art thou?” received no answer; but the adjuration of the high priest and the council, who were the representatives of God and the church, was met by the unhesitating response “I am,” as “thou sayest,” “the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Then, He no longer “made them to doubt,” but yielded His life into their hands for the whole extent of the truth as to the nature and origin of His mysterious Person.

In His *private* interview with Pilate, another opportunity was presented the Messiah to escape the cross. This, moreover, was directly opposed to His temptations when discoursing with the Jews, and when before the council. His enemies had been powerless to prevail with Pilate against his better judgment, till they declared, “We have a law, and by that law he ought to die,” hoping he would sentence Jesus to the cross. But here (and strangely?), instead of giving the reason for exercising that law, “because he *blasphemeth*,” they were impelled by some secret force to say, “because he made himself

the Son of God." * Blasphemy would have sufficed Pilate, before whose scrutiny every other accusation fell, and whom the dignity and majesty of Christ had so impressed that he was afraid to authorize His death. But "*that saying*" made him "the more afraid," and he was now "determined to let him go." † The Messiah need only admit to him, privately and indefinitely, that He was come from above, and he would be free, for the Gentile governor would not condemn Him for claiming to be the Son of God, even by generation. Hence His perfect silence when Pilate, on hearing that confession from the Jews, returned into the judgment hall and demanded of Him, "WHENCE art thou?" So mute was He, that His interrogator was provoked to say, "Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee? and have power to release thee?" Whereupon, Jesus, ignoring utterly the main question, responded, "Thou couldest have no power *at all* against me, except it were given thee from above."

Though Pilate labored hard to save Him from their hands, it simply might not be. Barabbas and the Christ, the guilty and the guiltless, the world and her Redeemer, could not both go free. That "*Whence*," the heathen authorities were not yet to know. The "truth," which would preserve Him from crucifixion and total abandonment, was forbidden to be uttered here. He, who "endured such contradiction of sinners against himself," was too loyal to encourage Pilate in his ignorant, though well-meant efforts to deliver his prisoner. Nor did He aught but submit to the malice of Satan, when he, with no hope nor wish to succeed, but in the very wantonness of his triumph, afflicted the pure soul of his victim with the wicked hints that here He could safely signify He was, in the highest sense, "the Son of God."

"And he that blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death, *and* all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as he that is born in the land,

* St. John xix. 7.

† Acts iii. 23.

when he blasphemeth the name of the LORD, shall be put to death," * was the law to which the Jews referred when they answered, "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die." Hence, when Pilate rejoined so promptly, "Take ye him, and judge him according to your law," they were in a great dilemma. They could not tell Pilate that they had already tried and sentenced Him, and would gladly have put Him to death "according to their law," long before this (and without troubling the governor) but they had been unable, in this man's case, to put "that law" into effect, simply because He, for some mysterious reason, would not submit to it.

The reason was mysterious, but it should not have been so to them, of all men. They should have known that God had given "His angels charge concerning him: and in their hands they were to bear him up, lest at any time he should" (but) "dash his foot against a stone." They ought to have known that God would not, even seemingly, set His seal to it that His Son was a blasphemer, by allowing Him the legal death for blasphemy,—that the Messiah was not to die on the ground, but in the air, for He had come to battle with and "destroy" "the prince of the power of the air,"—that Jesus was His own angel when He hid Himself from stoning; but when He "gave his back to the smiters and his face to shame and spitting," He was again "the Son of man," who was to be "lifted up." They "searched the Scriptures," and yet they knew not that the death appointed for blasphemy was the one which their Messiah was to avoid the most! They were ignorant that He was not to be stoned by a mob nor condemned by a civil tribunal; but to be tried and sentenced and hung up by the court ecclesiastic, in order that the Jewish church might give to the world her priceless gift—a Saviour.

In another way, no doubt, the Son of Man was confronted by Satan when He was before the high priest. The ignorance of His judge afforded Him a loop-hole of escape, and

* Leviticus xxiv. 16.

far more than the shame and torture of the cross, Jesus dreaded that utter desertion, which, for Him alone, of all its sufferers, hung over it. Though the high priest administered the oath in the same words that Peter confessed Him—"the living God"—it was done by him in the interpretation and faith of the scribe who rejected the Christ, when he said, "There is but one God," in the sense of but one Person or subsistence in the Godhead. For this interpretation, scribe and priest indeed were not wholly to blame; and Moses not at all. As "One LORD" in number and unity, God had commanded Moses to roll up the sacred significance of His name of Jehovah—(Man, or a Trinity in Unity)—that it might receive no contamination. Their God was to be known as "one," in distinction from the gods of the heathen, which were "many." The sacred Three were hidden under the One that they might not mislead His own people, nor be mistaken by the idolatrous nations around them for but another form of their own polytheism. But now that heathendom was to receive its death-blow, Jesus—who had come to fill out all the words as well as laws of Moses, and who was jealous far beyond him for the honor of God—was unfolding not only the significance of the Jewish watchword, "The LORD our God is one LORD," but the meaning of their God's mysterious name of "Jehovah" or "I AM THAT I AM." Therefore He who was to "taste death for every man," rejected the temptation of Satan to take advantage of the ignorance of His judge. He replied, not like the scribe, prudently and cautiously; nor, as Caiaphas questioned, ignorantly. Intelligently, and in the full scope of His own baptismal formula, He answered, "by the living God," as He ("the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost" together) is "one LORD," or *Man essential*; and whom, *as such*, Jesus Christ *by the incarnation* was to reveal as "is, and was, and is to come."

SECTION VI.

His Steadfastness.

"Before Pontius Pilate," St. Paul wrote to Timothy, "Christ Jesus witnessed a good confession," and before the high priest and council it is apparent that He also witnessed a good confession. To the oath and accusation: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God," He solemnly assented, "Thou hast said." And then, as the high priest did not fully comprehend the nature of the oath he had just administered, nor consequently the nature and extent of the reply thereto, this "Faithful," as well as "True Witness," immediately added, "Nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven."* "Then said they all, Art thou then" (as the Son of man) "the Son of God?"† "And he said unto them, Ye say that I am," or, "Ye say it, because I am."‡

If, as the author of the note quoted below so happily surmises, the council really "understood our Lord to mean by "Son of *man*" the *same* as "Son of God," it is not surprising that, having no conception of the trinity, and the incarnation, nor of God as Man in essence, they immediately said: "What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard (blasphemy) of his own mouth," and that "the whole multitude of them arose and led him unto Pilate." From their point of view, Jesus was speaking fearful blasphemy, and hence His prayer for them, "Father, forgive them, for they

* R. V. St. Matt. xxvi. 64.

† "'Art thou then the Son of God?' It is very remarkable that this second question is asked in immediate answer to our Lord's saying concerning the Son of *man*. Thus it seems the council understood our Lord to mean by "Son of man" the same as "Son of God." Or they may only have suspected that He so used the expression, and to make sure of His meaning asked Him distinctly, 'Art thou the Son of God?'" (See Com. on the New Test. St. Luke xxii. 70.)

‡ R. V. and N. T. Com.—*Ibid.*

know not what they do." When Daniel, the man greatly beloved and highly favored, saw, only "in a vision," "one" (merely) "like unto a son of man come with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days, and brought near before him, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom," he says, "my spirit was grieved in the midst of my body, and my thoughts much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me." * His paleness was like that of Belshazzar's when he saw the part of the hand that wrote on the wall, and "the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another."

Granting the Jews due allowance for ignorance and credit for honesty, what must those words of Jesus have been to them at this crisis! In their eyes there could be no higher nor greater blasphemy. Either afraid, or deeming it foolish to push the inference to its ultimate end, they supposed He meant that not only as man, but man created and mortal (for they really knew no other) He was the Son of God by generation. Accordingly they led him to Pilate to expose and verify the falsehood by His death. Surely He who escaped stoning, could, if immortal, elude crucifixion. To their surprise He yielded, and their pleasure and relief at the fact that He was mortal and could die on the tree overflowed in their remarks, when, as He hung on the cross, not only the rabble, but "also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the scribes and elders, He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said I am the Son of God;" that is, not only the Messiah who was to "abide forever," but the Son of God "equal," or of one nature and substance with the Father, "very God of very God." They little thought that to prove Him man would not disprove Him God, nor to prove Him mortal would disprove Him eternal. But they had great misgivings, for they afterward besought the stone, the seal and the watch, to insure the (pretended) resur-

* "Lit. my brightness was changed upon me, i. e., I grew pale." Com. on Old Test. and R. V. Dan. v. 6; vii. 13-15; 28.

rection of "that deceiver," whose rise and return would confirm all His claims.

The ignorance of His judge having presented a way for the Messiah to escape, it is more than probable that here Satan whispered, "Now is the time." The devil strove far more earnestly to entangle Him in thought, than ever the Pharisees and Sadducees did in word and deed, and it is not likely that at the close of His life He would relax his efforts. Jesus intimated that at this period he was to make a second great attack upon Him,* but that he should find nothing in Him, no evil to lay hold on. With "strong crying and tears" the Messiah had prayed to be saved from that crowning agony of the cross—the hiding of His Father's face—and "the Prince of this world," who in their last conflict was to be "judged and cast out," would gladly make use of His dread of being forsaken of God. It was an excellent argument for hinting that He should regard the high priest's oath as invalid, and either answer not at all, or, rating it at its worth from him, reply, not according to the words he used, "by the living God," but according to his and the whole council's low interpretation of those words—that there is but one person in the Godhead, and therefore God's life is incommunicable. By so doing, He would, by implication, have denied the trinity of Jehovah, and admitted, and thus virtually confessed, that He Himself could be, and was, no more than a great prophet or messenger from God, an angel or archangel perhaps, or even some higher being in human guise, but still one who was not, because he could not be, the *begotten* Son of God. And thus the great object of him "who was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth," would be accomplished—the self-destruction of the Christ. At the opening of his ministry, Satan sought to make the Messiah prove Himself, knowing that in the effort He would be destroyed. And, at the close of His ministry, he strove to make Him deny Himself, knowing that in this effort He would also be destroyed; and

* St. John xiv. 30.

either time, by Himself. But in each deadly encounter, the adversary was more than matched. For all time and all believers his plotting head was bruised by the Messiah's wounded heel.

That admission, could He have been prevailed upon to make it, whether through reservation or silence, Satan knew would as effectually prevent the Messiah from coming as king into possession of the Kingdom of God, as the scribes' ignoring of the words of Moses, hindered him from becoming a member of it. Had not Christ looked beyond the judge who adjured Him, and put His own faith and knowledge into the words of the high priest's oath, it had been no oath to Him, and He would have been free to remain as silent in his presence as in Pilate's, when he remonstrated, "Speakest thou not unto me?" or as He was before the same high priest when He held His peace at his command to answer the minor accusation of the suborned false witnesses. He chose to answer; and not like men, unto men, but unto God. Though all the consequences of His confession were fully in sight, not only the abuse and the cross which He should suffer from men, but the wrath and curse of God which He should endure when nailed on that cross as the representative of sin, and the substitute of sinners—Jesus of Nazareth never flinched nor swerved, but firmly set to His death-warrant the ineffaceable seal: "Thou hast said. I AM."

Scorning, at the dread moment, the hateful suggestions of Satan, "Save thyself," and "Come down," before the last great agony, the Messiah clung to His cross as to a throne. Nothing could shake his confidence in God, nor in Himself, as the Son of God. When forsaken of Him, He still called Him, "*My God, my God*;" and though His heart was broken with anguish, at the close He said, "*Father*, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

Of St. Paul it was said, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar," and of Jesus the Christ it may be said, He could have been released had He not ap-

pealed to the Triune God. The civil tribunal pronounced Him innocent and without a fault, and the ecclesiastical would have been obliged to do the same on the smallest admission that He was a little less than "equal with God." But this would have compromised the trinity of Jehovah, and Himself as one of its members, and therefore He held fast to the whole truth, abating not a jot of it. Paul preferred imprisonment, that he might preach Jesus to the Gentiles in the city of the Cæsars, and Christ chose death that He might plead for sinners at the court of Heaven. A task which His accusers and judges knew not of, was in store for the Messiah. For its accomplishment He had been "sifted as wheat," and being found of men "without sin," and of Satan "without guile" in heart or mouth, and of God to be equal to Himself in truth and holiness as well as essence and nature, He was acknowledged by Him to be His Son, and accepted to do the great works of fulfilling, by His death, the old dispensation, and introducing by His resurrection the new, and becoming, through these successive and united acts of Saviour and Mediator, the *Redeemer* of men.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Based on Martensen and Harless. By Revere Franklin Weidner, Doctor and Professor of Theology, etc. Philadelphia: G. W. Frederick. 1891. Price \$2.50.

This is a theological rather than a philosophical work. The author has aimed, as he says in the preface, to unite the philosophical character of Martensen's work on Ethics with the Biblical character of the work of Harless on the same subject, but he retains the theological standpoint throughout. His data he gets from the Scripture in the same way as in the case of a work on Dogmatic Theology. This is all right and proper in its way, but the result is a work in one of the departments of theology.

A philosophical ethics, on the other hand, starts from the data of reason, and may admit the light and guidance of revelation, just as a work on psychology may freely use the Scriptures where they bear upon the subject; but this is something different from what is called a Biblical psychology; such as the work of Delitzsch. A philosophical ethics is not necessarily un-Christian, or anti-Christian because the subject is treated from the standpoint of reason. On the other hand it may be eminently Christian, in so far forth as the author recognizes the harmony of reason and revelation, and the superior light of revelation so far as it bears on his subject. This, indeed, is the best way to harmonize reason and revelation. Just as a writer on dogmatics takes its data from revelation, yet seeks to present his subject according to reason, rationalizes revelation, so in the treatment of ethics he may start from the standpoint of reason and harmonize his work with revelation.

The author of this work points out the difference between religion and morality. They are inseparably united, yet they are not identical. Morality will always take its character from the character of the religion which intones it, and as Christianity is the highest and best religion, the absolute religion, so that morality is the highest and best which is moulded by Christianity. A science is not made Christian by merely introducing Scripture passages freely in its treatment, but rather by showing throughout its principles in harmony with those of Christianity.

It is in this way that Christian, or rather theological, ethics and philosophical ethics are drawing nearer together. Kant's Ethics is

not non-Christian because he starts from the intuition of the moral law enthroned in man, but rather because he rises no higher than the plane of legalism instead of love.

The work before us is not marked by originality, but it is an able reproduction, as the author says, of Martensen and Harless. The outline is a good one for bringing the different departments of ethics before the mind of the student. After the introduction it takes in the Highest Good, *summum bonum*, virtue, the Law, and then passes to individual ethics. This last receives a full treatment. Then comes social ethics, the family, the state, art and science, closing with a chapter on the church.

The author has spent many years in teaching the subject, and his long experience has been of great account, in enabling him to present his material in a lucid manner to the mind of the student. He has given us a work which is eminently adapted to theological seminaries. A similar work of a philosophical character, starting from the standpoint of reason, yet permeated by the light of revelation is yet a desideratum in this country.

THE CHURCH FOR THE TIMES. A Series of Sermons, by William Frederic Faber. "The Church's One Foundation, Is Jesus Christ Her Lord." Westfield, New York: The Lakeside Press, 1891. Contents: 1, The Church's Faith. 2, The Church's Worship. 3, The Divine Church. 4, The Church's Mission. 5, The Church's Method. 6, The Church's Confidence. Price in paper, 25 cents.

These sermons read like tracts for the times. They revive the old conception of the one holy, catholic, and apostolic church which has so largely dropped out of the faith of this generation. True, there has been awakened a tendency during the last quarter or half century to restore it in the minds and hearts of the people, but the evil wrought by the spirit of sect and schism in our common Protestantism has by no means yet been overcome. The subjectivism that came to the ascendant in the Reformation ran out in subsequent times to an almost losing sight of a real objective church. Individual liberty and individual piety are highly important, and they require to be emphasized, but no such liberty can thrive without recognizing the authority of the church, nor can personal piety be sound if it leaves out of view the mystery of the church. These sermons bring out clearly and forcibly the objective character of the church, and its divine character. It is refreshing to follow the preacher as he rises above all sectarianism in his description of the one church of Christ.

The sermon on worship is admirable, as are indeed all the others, but this comes home to us in the Reformed church on account of the long controversy and contest through which we had to pass before we reached a liturgy. Mr. Faber refers to the liturgy prepared for the Presbyterian churches in Scotland, and which is used in a large number of their churches, and adds that it is similar to the

form of worship used in *his* church. We brought a copy of this Scotch Liturgy with us from Edinburgh, where it was presented to us by Prof. Dr. Mitchell, of St. Andrews. It is about the size of, and very like, our Order of Worship.

The author of these sermons spent a year in our Seminary. Afterwards he read and studied the theological literature of our church in the *Mercersburg Review*, the writings of Dr. Nevin, etc., and, although pastor of a Presbyterian church, yet he is in hearty sympathy with our theology. But most of all he is an independent thinker and gives evidence of a maturity of mind and breadth of view which give good promise of his future. His article in the *Andover Review* on the Life of Dr. Nevin was a truly able production. We shall hear from Mr. Faber again, for such talent cannot be hid under a bushel.

MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. By George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1890. Price, 75 cents.

In this little volume of 120 pages we have truly *multum in parvo*. Designed "to prove that the narratives of the life of Jesus, which are contained in the New Testament, are true, and that Christianity has a supernatural, divine origin and sanction," it, in a brief but clear and connected form, presents all the more important evidence bearing on these points. Among the subjects discussed in the volume are the nature of the evidence, the possibility and proof of miracles, the supernatural origin of Christianity as involved in the portraiture of Jesus in the evangelists, the resurrection of Jesus, the genuineness of the gospels, and the proof of Christianity derived from prophecy, the conversion and career of the apostle Paul, the intrinsic excellence of the Christian system, the contrast of Christianity with other religions and with philosophic systems, and from its utility and its rapid spread in the first centuries. That these subjects are all treated in a scholarly and masterly manner the name of the author is itself a guarantee. The work ought to be widely circulated and deserves careful study. We know of no better popular manual of Christian evidence.

THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Lewis French Stearns, Professor of Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. Price, \$2.00.

We have read this volume with much interest and can heartily recommend it to our readers as well worthy their attention. The subject with which it has to do is a highly important one, and is treated in an unusually judicious manner. The author is not only a thorough scholar, but also a man of truly philosophic mind. Every page of his work gives evidence of acute and vigorous thought, and is written in a clear and forcible style. The special topics con-

sidered are the evidence of to-day, the author's philosophical presuppositions both theistic and anthropological, the genesis, growth and verification of the evidence of Christian experience, the philosophical and theological objections thereto, and its relation to other evidences. All these topics are very fully and thoroughly discussed. The book accordingly supplies a real want of our time and is a truly valuable contribution to our apologetical literature.

ROMANS DISSECTED. A Critical Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans. By E. D. McRea, Esq. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. Price, 60 cents.

This booklet, which has been published in German as well as in English, has already attracted considerable attention. Its author, whoever he may be, proves himself to be possessed of superior scholarship and talent. His object is to throw light upon some of the principles of the higher criticism. With this purpose in view he applies these principles to the Epistle to the Romans and shows that they practically make its Pauline origin inadmissible. A critical analysis of it he proves discloses the work of four different authors. Though he informs his readers in a postscript that he believes fully in the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Romans, he still thinks that he has made out a stronger case for the spuriousness and composite character of the Epistle than the real doubters themselves have done. The moral he leaves each one to draw for himself. We commend the book especially to the consideration of those who are disposed to accept unhesitatingly all the results of the higher criticism as regards the books of the Bible.

ENGLISH COMPOSITION. Eight Lectures given at the Lowell Institute. By Barrett Wendell, Assistant Professor of English at Harvard College. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. Price, \$1.50.

This is a masterly treatise. Of the various works on English composition with which we are acquainted, we know of none superior in value to this for ordinary readers. In a very admirable and interesting manner Professor Wendell sets forth the great principles which should govern those who would write for the instruction of the public in their choice of words and in the construction of sentences, paragraphs and whole compositions. He also lucidly points out the requisites of clearness, force and elegance of expression. His teaching of the principles of English composition, for the past ten years to the undergraduates of Harvard, has taught him just what instruction is ordinarily required, and this is what he imparts in the lectures before us. His book will consequently be found very serviceable by all who desire to write a clear, forcible and elegant style. Even practiced writers will find it profitable and interesting reading.

JAPANESE GIRLS AND WOMEN. By Alice Mabel Bacon. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company, The Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1891. Price, \$1.25.

To understand properly the character of a people we must acquaint ourselves not only with their political history but also with their social life. As woman is always an important factor in the latter, we need, therefore, to know something about her condition and training if we would form a correct idea of what any nation really is. The volume before us treats accordingly not only of an interesting, but, also, of an important portion of the inhabitants of Japan. In it we are informed concerning the condition of woman in this Island Empire. Her childhood and education; her marriage and divorce; her treatment as a wife and mother, and in old age; her life in court, in castle, in peasant's home, and in domestic service; her condition in the country and in the cities, are all minutely and charmingly portrayed. The book is consequently both delightful and instructive reading, and cannot fail, we think, to awaken increased interest in the Land of the Rising Sun, and in its conversion to Christ.